

SENATE—Friday, January 18, 1991

(Legislative day of Thursday, January 3, 1991)

The Senate met at 10 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Honorable THOMAS A. DASCHLE, a Senator from the State of South Dakota.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore [Mr. BYRD].

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, January 18, 1991.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, section 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable THOMAS A. DASCHLE, a Senator from the State of South Dakota, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
President pro tempore.

Mr. DASCHLE thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

CONDITIONAL RECESS UNTIL
TUESDAY, JANUARY 22, 1991, AT
2:30 P.M.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will stand in recess until 2:30 p.m., Tuesday, January 22, 1991.

Thereupon the Senate, at 10 o'clock and 37 seconds a.m., recessed, under the order of Thursday, January 17, 1991, until Tuesday, January 22, at 2:30 p.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Friday, January 18, 1991

The House met at 12 noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Hear these words from Psalm 33:
Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord, the people whom he has chosen as his heritage!

You have promised, O loving God, that You hear our earnest prayers and in that spirit we place before You our words of thanksgiving for Your everlasting grace together with the personal petitions of our own hearts.

For the President and the Congress and the men and women of the armed services, we pray for courage and fortitude and strength. During these days, when our minds and thoughts are filled with the emotions of conflict, we reach out in prayer for those people who must take the lead and bear the burden of decision. We specially remember George Bush and Norm Schwarzkopf and others whom we name in our hearts before You. O gracious God, whose power created the heavens and the Earth and whose mercy is without end, bless and guide them and keep us all in Your mighty hand, this day and every day. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. LEWIS of California led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 2. Concurrent resolution supporting the U.S. presence in the Persian Gulf.

The message also announced that, pursuant to Public Law 94-201, the

Chair on behalf of the President pro tempore, appoints Robert Malir, Jr., of Kansas, to the Board of Trustees of the American Folklife Center.

SADDAM HUSSEIN'S BOMBING OF ISRAEL PROVES HIS RUTHLESS INTENTIONS

(Mr. FROST asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, if there was any doubt at all about the ruthlessness of Iraqi leader Saddam Hussein, that has now been dispelled. With last night's unprovoked bombing of Israel, Saddam laid bare to the world his intent to expand the conflict and his willingness to attack innocent civilians in order to further destabilize and terrorize the nations of the Middle East.

Throughout the last several weeks as Saddam Hussein threatened the nation of Israel, and in the immediate hours since the bombing, the Israeli Government has shown admirable restraint. Certainly, the instinct of any proud and free nation would be to respond immediately to an unprovoked attack, especially when there is danger of further attack.

It can be expected that Israel will respond to the attack on its civilian population. Certainly, a response is understandable. It is my hope, that the Israeli response will be measured and carried out in full coordination with the allied forces in the Persian Gulf.

As the conflict continues into its third day, as the horror and cost of war are fully realized, the allied nations in the gulf must remain united and committed. Saddam Hussein's brutal attack of Israel is a desperate attempt to drive us apart. It should instead, unite us and strengthen our resolve to end Saddam's reign of terror.

The resolution before us today gives this body another opportunity to renew our commitment to the men and women fighting in the Persian Gulf. And, just as Saddam Hussein's bombing of Israel removed any doubt of his ruthless intentions, passage of this resolution will remove any doubt that the United States Congress stands united with the President and shares his resolve to bring peace and stability to the Persian Gulf.

BIG OIL'S SHAM ATTEMPT TO STABILIZE OIL PRICES

(Mr. CONTE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the President should be commended for his decision late Wednesday night to release oil from the strategic petroleum reserve.

The possibility of flooding the market at this time with our stockpiles should keep the market stable in this time of crisis, and protect our economy from damaging high oil prices. Big Oil has even taken steps to keep oil prices down. Some oil companies decided to freeze oil prices. But they just do not know how to do something without hurting the American consumer.

Mr. Speaker, Big Oil announced their price freeze when the price of crude oil is dropping like a stone. In fact, yesterday the Mercantile Exchange was shut down because oil was dropping so quickly. It eventually settled \$10.56 lower at \$21.44 per barrel, the biggest drop in Merc history. Nice try Big Oil, but we will all be watching you.

PRAISE FOR ISRAEL'S RESTRAINT IN THE FACE OF ADVERSITY

(Mr. SCHUMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, last night the world stood witness to the brilliant courage of our ally, Israel.

Israel, not even a member of the international coalition against Iraq, took Iraqi Scud missile hits to its largest civilian centers, and up to this point has not chosen to retaliate. What other nation in the world would lay down its right to self-defense after a wanton missile attack? What country in a sea of hostility would have the self-confidence and equanimity to wait?

Israel's great confidence in the United States and its willingness to forgo a military response to a missile attack is an example of awesome restraint.

In the future when Israel comes under increasingly heavy pressure to make a compromise in terms of territory for peace, we must all remember the difficulty of her position and her willingness to take the extra step for peace. What a tragic irony it would be if Israel's cooperation has sown the seeds of her demise.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

PERSIAN GULF OPERATIONS CONTINUE

(Mr. COUGHLIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, the latest turn of events in the Persian Gulf merits further comment.

First, we condemn, in the most unequivocal terms, the dastardly missile attack initiated on Israel by Saddam Hussein. This further aggression on a nation that was not a party to the conflict, against highly populated civilian targets, was a thoroughly cowardly misdeed. On the bright side, if there can be one, is the fact that chemical weapons were not involved in this attack. The evidence strongly suggests that the coalition's initiation of the liberation of Kuwait at this time, rather than after another 6 months or a year as some had argued, allowed us to strike before the Iraqis were able to perfect their plans to marry chemical warheads with their Scud and other ballistic missiles. This is but another strong justification for initiating the liberation of Kuwait now.

Second, I want to take this opportunity to commend the President and his administration for the excellent leadership that has been provided to date. I also want to commend our allies in the coalition, who stand with us now in the firmest way and have demonstrated concretely that the rape of Kuwait and Saddam Hussein's criminality are indeed world concerns.

Third, I would note that our ability to use our military technology effectively in the current conflict—one the likes of which have never been seen before—is unquestionably related to the attention that the Armed Forces received under the Reagan-Bush era. We have always emphasized our technology, training, and brain power in our military operations as America has always avoided using our servicemen and servicewomen as cannon fodder. The Reagan-Bush buildup, thankfully, provided our forces with the best and most technically advanced equipment and training available, and this without doubt has been a critical factor in enhancing our effectiveness and reducing our losses.

Finally, we call on all Americans to join together in their prayers for the safety of our service people and those of our allies—some of whom already, it seems, have made the supreme sacrifice—and to pray, too, for the earliest possible end to hostilities with the least loss of life.

□ 1210

LET US GET IT OVER WITH

(Mr. FLAKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, today I come as one of those persons who voted against the resolution last week. I am still no more in favor of war today than I was a week ago.

However, there is a reality that we are now in the midst of a war. I think that all of us have an obligation to support the President, support our troops who are on the battlefield, to give forth in whatever manner we can our understanding of what it takes for us to be able to win this war.

Last night's events in Israel indicate to us very clearly that compromise will not come. Therefore, I am asking the President of the United States to go forth, let us end this quickly, let us get our troops back home, let us get it over with so that our people might be able to know the joy of peace once again.

WHAT A DIFFERENCE A WEEK MAKES

(Mr. LEWIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, what a difference a week makes. Only a week ago, we were a Congress divided. Only 250 Republicans and Democrats showed their support for the President. Today, as Congress convenes, that vote of approval will be near unanimous. For the record, it should be noted that there were voices from the other side of the aisle who did not want to have today's resolution include expression of support for our President. Following that course would have injected pure partisanship into this crisis. To the leadership's credit, Members were convinced that they would look silly attempting to make political hay over who should get the credit for our successes. The Middle East challenge is an American challenge. Partisanship has no place in this debate.

WE DO NOT HAVE TO BE LECTURED ON PATRIOTISM

(Mr. RANGEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise, like so many of my colleagues, to support our fighting men and women who are in the Persian Gulf. I support those who have volunteered and have dedicated themselves to protect our national security.

But I want to make it abundantly clear that I have more friends, more family, and more constituents in the military than probably most Members in this Congress, and I object to those who would say that we lack patriotism when we can support our men and

women in the military and at the same time vigorously disagree with the policies of the President of the United States.

We do not have to be lectured on patriotism as it relates to the policies of the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, and so I reserve the right as a Member of Congress to support our men and women in the Persian Gulf, and nobody in this House or in this country is going to browbeat me about disagreeing with the President on our policy in the Persian Gulf.

TRIBUTE TO LT. COMDR. MICHAEL SPEICHER

(Mr. JAMES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, America learned that Lt. Comdr. Michael Speicher of Jacksonville is our first to fall in Operation Desert Storm.

Our hearts go out to all who will miss Commander Speicher's wisdom and love in the years that should have been.

There is nothing this House can do like that which he has done.

But what we can do, we should.

We should join battle, when we must, armed with the best weapons America can devise, allied with the civilized world and with political goals and military objectives, work together to bring war to a quick end.

We should join battle, when we must, only in the cause of those who fought Nazi tyranny, who died because this Nation could not endure half slave and half free, who established American independence.

This government will provide for those who have borne the battle, and the widows and the orphans.

More important are friends and neighbors, offering support and love and prayer.

The rest we leave to God, who promised that though we walk in the valley of the shadow of death, we should fear no evil.

RESOLUTION SHOULD INCLUDE CALL FOR A MIDDLE EAST PEACE CONFERENCE

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the use of force, and I still do not like the fact that it is basically Americans, once again, in the front lines. But now that our troops are in combat, I stand behind our troops and behind our President.

I say to those Americans who want to protest war, "Why do you not burn the Iraqi flag this time? You can protest war without burning Old Glory."

But I say today that I am going to support the resolution, but it does not go far enough. Congress should support and include a provision that calls for the convening of a Middle East peace conference immediately after this war. I submit to the Members that the Arab-Israeli conflict must be addressed, and that bombs will never cure cancer.

I would like to see that provision included in this, and hopefully when it is over a conference on peace, for a lasting peace, might take place in the Middle East.

AMERICA IS UNITED

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to read a letter to you, because it shows how united this country is behind their President and his Persian Gulf policy. The letter comes from one of the towns I represent in the New York Hudson Valley:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I wish to congratulate you for the swift and immediate action taken to free the country of Kuwait from the Iraqi dictator Saddam Hussein.

The town of Hyde Park, home of another great President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, salutes you.

We pray this conflict will soon end and that our military forces will return home safely.

Mr. President, we support you one hundred percent.

God bless,

LEWIS J. DEPPNER,
Town Supervisor.

TOWN OF HYDE PARK, NY.

Mr. Speaker, America is united, and no matter how deep Saddam Hussein's bunker is, I am sure he is getting the message today.

TRIBUTE TO TROOPS FROM RHODE ISLAND

(Mr. REED asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in the name of the 115th Military Police Company from Pawtucket, the 119th Military Police Company of Cranston, RI, the 76th Maneuver Training Command from Cranston and all the other troops activated from Rhode Island.

This week I was with the 115th at Fort Devens and the 119th and the MTC at Fort Pickett. I am extraordinarily proud of the job these young men and women are doing and I am honored to represent them here in the U.S. Congress.

I am thinking today of the LaPlume brothers, Mike and John, who are keeping each others spirits up, of Lieutenant Ryan whose husband Jack is home with Matthew and Jenny, and of 1st

Sgt. Edward McConnell whose wife Deborah is organizing a support network for service families and whose son Edward will be celebrating his 11th birthday on January 25.

Last night, as I learned of the attack on Israel I thought of these troops and the job they would be called on to do. This unprovoked attack by Iraq is a reminder that we are in the beginning of what could be a lengthy military campaign.

I will vote on today's resolution in support of our troops because these fine men and women deserve just that from the Congress. They deserve this expression of our continued commitment to back their efforts.

IRAQ'S OUTRAGEOUS MISSILE ATTACK ON ISRAEL

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my outrage at Saddam Hussein's latest and most diabolical act. Last night, Iraq launched 7 to 10 Scud missiles aimed at Israel. The cities of Haifa, Tel Aviv, Ha Tikva, and other Israeli communities were victimized by the fulfillment of Saddam Hussein's diabolical pledge to draw Israel into the conflict—a nation which up until now, has not been a part of this conflict.

It is obvious that the Iraqi missile attack on Israel was a manifestation of Saddam Hussein's attempt to divide the multinational allied forces in the Persian Gulf.

This, however, has not occurred, and it will not occur. President Hosni Mubarek of Egypt stated that: "Every nation has a right to defend itself." These sentiments were reiterated by Saudi Arabia's Ambassador to France in the context last night's attack. Both Egypt and Saudi Arabia condemned the attack.

Last night, Israel's Ambassador to the United States summed it up most poignantly when he noted that although his nation chose to be a non-combatant, "it has now suffered more than any of the allies involved in Desert Shield other than Kuwait itself" and that since Israel took a calculated risk in its tough decision to refrain from a preemptive strike, it now "reserves the right to respond in any way it deems fit."

Let us join President Bush in expressing our own outrage at this latest despicable act. It is now of the utmost importance that despite any possible reprisal by Israel that we convince our Arab allies to remain unified in our common purpose of overcoming the ruthless aggression of dictator Saddam Hussein.

□ 1220

OPERATION DESERT STORM

(Mr. BUSTAMANTE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BUSTAMANTE. Mr. Speaker, 6 days ago, the world watched as this body engaged in historic debate on the question of whether we should authorize the President to commit this country to a war against Iraq. Now—42 hours after the first wave of United States planes crossed Iraqi airspace—all indications are that phase 1 of our engagement is meeting with great success. As one who opposed the Solarz-Michel resolution, I rise to pledge my support for our troops who are engaged in battle and to our Commander in Chief.

On Saturday, this House was divided over the war question. It's now time to unite behind the President's decision and commit ourselves to providing our troops with every available resource they need to accomplish their mission swiftly, decisively, and with minimum casualties. A measure of tribute is due also to the U.S. defense industry. The \$2.7 trillion investment this country made over the last decade in high technology, military hardware is now paying dividends.

Early accounts indicate that our smart weapons, our night-vision capability, our tactical fighters, our air defense systems are exceeding expectations with their precision and reliability. The technological advances of our defense industry equipped our soldiers with the means to engage in combat effectively, while maximizing their ability to protect themselves. The defense industrial base has delivered on its promises.

Like others, I, too, caution against predictions of an early victory.

However, the military display we have seen thus far is truly impressive. I share the hopes of many in our Nation for a quick conclusion to the conflict, and the safe return of our troops.

MESSAGE TO SADDAM HUSSEIN

(Mr. DORNAN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, in the Vietnam war from 1965 to 1972, we only used our technology and our personnel correctly for 8 days in December 1972. For the last 2 days in Iraq and Kuwait, we have also made proper use of our higher degree of technology and training. So we have learned from our Vietnam experience. In 1972 when we bombed Hanoi and Haiphong and other serious targets, for the first time in a decade, the air environment was maybe 100 times more dangerous than it is over Iraq. Recall that we lost 17 B-52's, and many fight-

ers. Hanoi had tortured to death at least 12 of our pilots. In the prison camps they killed maybe 2 dozen enlisted men, torturing them in camps. Another 100 men were murdered in the fields and never made it to the camps.

Amman radio has reported that Iraq has a captured pilot in Baghdad. They brought him to town in a taxicab, and tonight they will put him on display the way the North Vietnamese did some of our B-52 crews in December 1972.

The rules of the House, Mr. Speaker, say we cannot address any person directly through C-SPAN or CNN. We have to talk through the Speaker. Therefore, I am telling the Speaker to tell Mr. Jasim, the Information Minister, who said he would torture, barbeque, and eat our pilots, that if one hair on the head of that naval aviator is harmed, he will hang from a gallows as did the camp commandant at Auschwitz. I stood and touched the gallows last year where they hanged the camp commandant. If he harms our pilot Jasim will go through a trap door and be hanged by the neck like Homma, the Japanese war criminal from Japan. Read the "Nuremberg Trials," Mr. Jasim and Mr. Saddam Hussein, and treat our prisoners the way we will treat your prisoners: With dignity and humane treatment under the Geneva Convention.

SUPPORT FOR SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 2

(Mr. MONTGOMERY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of our President and our military forces fighting in the Persian Gulf. I commend our other allies for their air participation and I stress that this is a U.N. operation, implemented by U.N. Resolution 678.

I have been a strong believer in the total force, where active and reservists train and fight side by side, whether in the air, on the ground or at sea.

I have learned that air guardsmen and air reservists were used in the initial airstrikes. We must not forget that the air guardsmen and air reservists have been flying C-141's, C-5A's, C-130's and KC-135 aircraft in the Persian Gulf every day since August 2.

For Saddam Hussein's information, we have thousands of reservists in the pipeline, training and getting ready to join Operation Desert Storm and give a rotation to our forces in the gulf.

And we still have 1 million selected reservists who have not been called to active duty and who are available, so a draft of young men is not necessary. The active forces feel they can make their recruiting strength quotas in the next few months with no problem.

If the Defense Department requests it, I will introduce and move through our Veterans' Affairs Committee a bill raising the limits of our GI life insurance from \$50,000 to \$100,000, and consider making it retroactive to cover Operation Desert Storm.

SUPPORT FOR RESOLUTION OFFERS ENCOURAGEMENT

(Mr. GEKAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, many people in the media, analysts and commentators, have said, why is the Congress wasting its time with a resolution such as the one we are contemplating today? They said, does the Congress not have anything better to do, more important to do? At this juncture in our history, there is nothing more important than to signify our full support for the young people who are serving their country in the Persian Gulf.

Is there not an additional reason? Are there not those young people there being barraged with cries from protestors and antiwar people, just at the moment when they need the highest part of encouragement possible? That is why we need to pass this resolution, and to show them, once and for all, and continuously, that Congress, the people's representatives, are 100 percent behind them, are willing to do their part here in the home front to make sure that their mission will be accomplished successfully. I support the resolution.

PERSIAN GULF RESOLUTION

(Mr. MAVROULES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAVROULES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to add my voice to the chorus of support for the men and women of our Armed Forces who are carrying out their missions with professional excellence, dedicated patriotism, and remarkable bravery.

It was with great sorrow I learned of Iraq's reckless assault on Israel last night. Saddam Hussein's seemingly desperate and unjustified missile assault on Tel Aviv, Haifa, and their suburbs serves to underscore the precarious and uncontrollable nature of a war environment. Saddam's counterattack also highlights the critical need for unity—unity of purpose at home, and unity of resolve abroad.

The people of the United States, Israel, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, and the 24 other nations of our international coalition share a common goal: the unconditional liberation of Kuwait. At a time when the coalition is being tested, in the aftermath of the Israeli assault,

it is more important than ever to stand together as one nation—united in support of the men and women carrying out the courageous mission of Operation Desert Storm.

As the crisis grows, and military conflict escalates, emotions fluctuate more dramatically from fear to outrage, from despair to hope. And at this sensitive moment in history, I join my colleagues in saluting not just the men and women of our international coalition bravely executing Operation Desert Storm but also the innocent civilians in Israel, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and surrounding areas, traumatized and endangered by the outbreak of war in their region.

To the families of the courageous participants in Operation Desert Storm, we extend to you our sincere gratitude and hope, gratitude for your strength during this trying time, and hope for your loved ones safe and speedy return.

IRAQI AGGRESSION UNPROVOKED

(Mr. PAXON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAXON. Mr. Speaker, last night's attack targeted on innocent Israeli civilians, underscored Saddam Hussein's brutality, and proves that no neighbor of Iraq is safe from Saddam's unprovoked aggression.

□ 1230

The Iraqi attack further justifies the ongoing destruction of Saddam Hussein's military capability by our allied forces.

Israel is America's only long-term ally and the only true democracy in the Middle East. An attack on Israel demands our response.

Moreover, the world community must react with anger and with action whenever innocent civilians are targeted by a tyrant like Saddam, whether it be in Kuwait, in Israel or wherever.

In its unprecedented restraint following the attack, Israel has certainly gone the extra mile in support of our overall objectives in the Persian Gulf.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Israel deserve our deep appreciation.

A COWARDLY AND HEINOUS ACT

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, others have spoken. Last night Saddam Hussein committed a cowardly and heinous act, one worthy of the most evil figures in world history.

Last night Saddam's deadly missiles were used in a criminal act in a class with those evil figures. He fired armed

missiles at the innocent civilian population of a noncombatant nation in the Persian Gulf conflict. This is, however, certainly consistent with his previous inhuman attacks on his own people and the rape of Kuwait.

This attack was conducted in full knowledge that the missiles could have fallen directly onto sleeping children and innocent women in Israel or in Jordan.

Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, last night's attack on Israel did not cause the damage it could have; but Saddam has once again shown his inhumanity with this cowardly and criminal act. This attack last night was a bigoted and despicable effort to concentrate hate and prejudice toward an innocent bystander and away from himself. That is indeed what Adolf Hitler did in the 1930's and 1940's. His effort to split the unprecedented coalition arrayed against him will fail, and his rhetoric will ring as hollow as his motives.

The Israelis have reacted with maturity and courage, saying this morning that they will not retaliate unless there is another attack; but Saddam must know that the forces allied against him in the gulf will take every step possible to permanently eliminate his military capability to attack Israel or any other of his neighbors.

The world, Mr. Speaker, must not forget this latest outrage.

TODAY'S RESOLUTION IS "OPERATION CYA" FOR DEMOCRATS

(Mr. DANNEMEYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I wonder why we have been called back today to vote on a new resolution that simply confirms last week's resolution to support the President and the inevitability of Operation Desert Storm? Could it be that the Democrat leadership in the House has been watching public opinion polls supporting the President and Desert Storm? Could it be that the Democrat leadership has been caught with their sanctions down and has divined the political necessity to undertake their own strategic operation: Operation CYA.

Mr. Speaker, Members wishing to know the meaning of the code name should call the Democrat Cloakroom where operators will be eager to debrief Members. No doubt, concerned Members will also be able to receive the latest Democrat intelligence on how to deflect criticisms concerning past defense votes, votes which appropriated funds to pay for the high-tech weaponry used today to protect American lives and efficiently serve American interests.

SUPPORT OUR ARMED FORCES

(Mr. ANNUNZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I commend the patriotism, bravery, and professionalism of our Armed Forces at war in the Middle East.

I pray that the President will guide these loyal service men and women to victory with the lowest possible number of casualties.

With each passing minute, tens of thousands of our military personnel are risking their lives in this war. We as a Congress must support them and our President at this critical hour.

The time for debate has passed. Let us unite behind our troops as they fight for freedom. I urge bipartisan support for Senate Concurrent Resolution 2.

THE CONFLICT IN THE PERSIAN GULF AND THE MIDDLE EAST

(Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, as President Bush said, "The battle has been joined." The American people and the Congress have closed ranks, standing united behind our President and our brave men and women of the Armed Forces of the United States. They are truly the most professional and effective fighting force that has ever been assembled.

We all pray that our forces and the nearly 30-nation allied force arrayed against Saddam Hussein will be able to bring conflict to a decisive and speedy conclusion and with a minimum loss of life.

The world under the leadership of President Bush has acted to evict Hussein from Kuwait and to show that naked aggression will fail. I fully support the President in this troubling time.

TIME FOR GORBACHEV TO WITHDRAW FROM THE BALTICS

(Mr. DURBIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, our hearts and prayers are with our fighting forces in the Middle East and with the innocent victims in Israel, the most recent victims of Iraqi aggression; but I rise today to speak to another part of the world on another issue.

The most recent winner of the Nobel Peace Prize, Mikhail Gorbachev, has now sent tanks and paratroopers into Lithuania and killed 15 innocent people, their bodies ripped by machineguns and crushed by Soviet tanks.

What was the crime of these Lithuanian martyrs? They simply wanted freedom.

And what was the response of Mikhail Gorbachev? Mr. Gorbachev denied any responsibility for this savagery, and when the free press, the remaining free press in the Soviet Union contradicted the Soviet disinformation campaign about Lithuania, Mikhail Gorbachev called for press censorship.

Mr. Speaker, I pray that our dream of glasnost did not end on the bloody cobblestones of Vilnius. It is time for Mikhail Gorbachev to withdraw his intimidating forces from Lithuania and the Baltic Republics and for the United States to make it clear we will not tolerate the aggression of Saddam Hussein or Mikhail Gorbachev.

THE PRESIDENT AND OUR TROOPS NEED AND MERIT CONGRESSIONAL SUPPORT

(Mrs. BENTLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, for the first time since June 6, 1944, members of the armed forces from many nations are joined together in a cooperative military operation that would do more than liberate Kuwait or protect oil. It is an operation that signals that power-hungry dictators will no longer hold the world hostage.

Any questions about the ambitions or the crazed nature of Saddam Hussein were dispelled forever by his unprovoked assault upon Israel last night. So, too, were the questions as to why military force is appropriate.

President Bush, with diplomacy and resolve, is solely responsible for building this effective coalition of the allied forces. The whole world is looking to us, Congress, to see whether we unconditionally support the President and the ongoing efforts in the gulf.

The President needs and merits our unconditional support. Our men and women in uniform and all of the coalition forces also need and merit our unconditional support.

Vote "yes" on today's resolution.

IN STRONG SUPPORT OF SENATE RESOLUTION TODAY

(Mr. SCHEUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, let me at the outset express my strong support for the Senate resolution in which both the House and the Senate will express virtual unanimity in their support for the President and our more than 400,000 magnificent troops in the Saudi Arabian desert. They have performed in an extraordinarily professional and effective manner this first 36

hours of the war. Our hearts go out to them in admiration for the extraordinary talent, dedication, and courage that they have shown.

I would also like to congratulate the Israelis for the very great restraint and wisdom that they have demonstrated by not responding to Saddam Hussein's cruel, vindictive, vicious, barbaric act of attacking yet another one of his neighbors in the Middle East in the last 5 hours.

The Israelis understand full well, as the Americans understand, that Saddam Hussein is exercising every wile, every deceit, every form of treachery, and every form of beguilement in an effort to suck the Israelis into this conflict, desperately trying to convert it into an Arab-Israeli War, a holy Jihad.

□ 1240

The Israelis know how destructive that would be; we all know how destructive that would be. Both sides understand perfectly what Saddam Hussein was aiming for and what he had in mind when he perpetrated that vicious, unprovoked assault last night.

I hope and pray that the Israelis can continue this sensitive balancing act between ignoring Saddam Hussein's bait and the need to protect the safety of the Israeli public.

They have performed with great responsibility up to now, and I only hope to God that they can continue in that course of wisdom and moderation.

ADEQUATE DEFENSE AGAINST BALLISTIC MISSILE ATTACK

(Mr. KYL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, we are already learning the lessons of the experiences of conducting the operations in Desert Storm.

I find it ironic, however, that it took CNN to bring home to us a lesson some of us have been trying to teach for some time, and that is that the defenses against ballistic missiles can work.

We finally saw it on CNN today when one of our Patriot missile batteries was able to shoot down a Scud missile somewhere in the vicinity of Saudi Arabia. It brings home to all of us the fact that ballistic missile defenses can work.

But the sad truth is that we do not have them deployed yet. The people of Tel Aviv and Haifa last night learned that lesson. We can only hope and pray that tonight that lesson will not be learned in a more devastating way with greater casualties, and in the days and evenings to come.

It is time for the U.S. Congress to support President Bush for the development and ultimate deployment of strategic defenses against ballistic mis-

siles. It is time for us to support that program, and I am very hopeful that as we have the debate in the next months over support and financing of the SDI, that my colleagues will join me in supporting that program in the most robust way so that never again will we face the charge that we could have been ready but, because of our intransigence, we were not.

ISRAEL UNDER ATTACK

(Mr. MAZZOLI asked and was given permission to address the House and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, the attack on Israel last night by Iraqi Scud missiles ordered by Saddam Hussein was cowardly and barbaric. But, I think it will be ultimately futile. I do not believe it will break the coalition apart.

Nevertheless it has ominous implications with respect to the Israelis, who are the ultimate target of those weapons who face the possibility of death. It has implications to the coalition and implications as well to people who live in Louisville and in Jefferson County, in my district, who have relatives and loved ones living in Israel today.

Israel has until now used admirable restraint and patience, almost that of Job under these provocative circumstances. We all hope that this admirable restraint continues.

Saddam Hussein must know, however, that continuation of his barbarisms will earn for him the continued enmity of the world. It will earn him the implacable opposition of all of the coalition partners and their implacable application of force against him. It will also make the ultimate settlement of Mideast grievances even more difficult.

Once again, we salute Israel on its remarkable patience under the circumstances. If that patience continues, so much the better, if it does not continue, it is not the fault of Israel but it is the fault of Saddam Hussein.

OUR BRAVE MILITARY PERSONNEL ARE PUTTING THEIR LIVES ON THE LINE

(Mr. ROHRABACHER asked and was given permission to address this House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, America is standing tall in the Persian Gulf. We are protecting our vital interests, and we are deterring the future aggression of dictators like Saddam Hussein. We should take time, and as we are today, to express our appreciation to the brave military personnel putting their lives on the line, putting themselves in harm's way for our benefit.

But let us remember that it was the Reagan policy of a strong national defense, it was the Reagan policy of pro-

viding our men and women in the military the weapons and technology they needed to defend this country that is permitting our military people to do their job and to come home safely.

As our military shrinks in the years ahead because we are entering a post-cold-war world, let us pray that that trend continues, but let us insure that our military people continue to have the weapons that they need, because if we have a smaller military, it behooves us as Members of Congress to allocate the funds necessary so that they never face a technologically superior enemy and they too can do their job and come home safely.

REAFFIRMATION OF WISDOM OF PROVIDING MODERN, SOPHISTICATED WEAPONS TO OUR PEOPLE IN UNIFORM

(Mr. RAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, for many years our research and development of modern and sophisticated weapons, which we have fought many years to provide to our service people and our military and which are being used today in such a fine manner, reaffirms the wisdom of our investment in these systems through the years. We can all be thankful that today, without reservation, our soldiers and service people have the very best modern weapons systems in the world.

Let me take a moment, my friends, to caution us all against overoptimism about a quick solution to the Middle East conflict.

Saddam Hussein has proved to be a survivor through adverse conditions through the years, and we do not believe he is going to go easy. But, my friends, we know that he is going to go.

So let us not be overoptimistic at this time.

DESIRABILITY OF DEFENSIVE MISSILE SYSTEMS

(Mr. KASICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, it is very early to make any assessments, but I would like to associate myself with the gentleman from Arizona's remarks in terms of his comments on the desirability of some kind of a defensive system that we can use and our allies can use to protect us against ballistic missile attacks.

I have had some issue with an administration that wanted to go the full space-deployed system that was designed to operate against a full-scale Soviet attack. I was one who was skeptical about the success of such a system. But clearly this civilization is

able to develop a ground-based system, perhaps even that has some air component, which can protect us against a ballistic missile attack.

As we sit and wait anxiously to see further developments in the gulf, it sure would be nice if we had developed and continued to develop a system that can protect not only our forces but also one that would give the Israelis an opportunity to fend off any ballistic missile attack that is coming. I know that there are some in the Armed Services Committee, such as Chairman ASPIN, who is willing to do research in this. I would just urge that we go forward on a bipartisan basis to make sure that ballistic missile technology is part of any future defense bill.

I think this situation, the current situation in the gulf right now, is the best example and offers us the best reasons as to why we must go forward in this critical area to protect our people against ballistic missile attacks.

OUR GOALS SHOULD BE: A COMPREHENSIVE ENERGY POLICY, NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION, AND RESTRICTIONS ON SALES OF ARMAMENTS

(Mrs. KENNELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I too am very glad we are gathered today in the Hall of the House to pay tribute to our President and his generals and how they have planned and executed that plan these last 2 days.

I also, obviously, want to congratulate and salute those absolutely marvelous, well-trained professional pilots that we have for the United States of America.

But at this time I think it is not too soon to begin learning lessons about this whole situation. First, we should have a comprehensive energy policy, one that we can have and work toward not only for pollution but for situations that we have now that never again we will be so reliant on Persian Gulf oil.

The second thing we should do is rededicate ourselves to nonproliferation of nuclear weapons. How different the situation would be if Saddam Hussein had nuclear weapons at this very time.

The third thing I think we should pay attention to and think about and really begin to plan about is the whole question of the selling of arms. All through the history of the world there have been arms merchants, sales of armaments, whether they be in public or in the black market.

But how different last night would have been, as we held our breaths, when we knew that those scuds were going toward Israel, Soviet weapons given to Saddam Hussein, liquid-fueled fortunately, the destruction was con-

tained but how different if they were nuclear missiles.

What if they had better, sophisticated weapons as we ourselves have been able to use?

We should be very, very much up front about saying we should not be the arms merchants of the world. We are a superpower, and we should be the ones who set what will happen in the future—and large arms sales is not the answer if we truly want a peaceful world.

□ 1250

IN SUPPORT OF SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 2

(Mr. WOLF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to add my full and unequivocal support for the resolution we will be considering today commending the leadership of the President as Commander in Chief of the operations in the Persian Gulf, and in particular the men and women of the U.S. Armed Forces on the front lines in the gulf.

It is absolutely crucial that the Congress and the American people come together now, united behind the President and his efforts in carrying out the U.N. resolution calling for the withdrawal of Iraq from Kuwait.

I think the President has handled himself in a superb manner, and I think, when we pass this resolution, we are also commending Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney, who was a former colleague in our House who we should all, on both sides of the aisle in the House, be so proud of. I also think it is a commendation of Secretary Baker, and Gen. Colin Powell and all of our top leaders who are directing this operation.

It is doubly critical that we stand behind the United States troops, who have been called to action in the Persian Gulf and who are a part of the allied forces' campaign to liberate Kuwait, and for their commanding officers who are directing the multinational operation.

In the first hours of action on late Wednesday evening Washington time and since those early hours in this campaign we have witnessed the courage and skill of our Armed Forces. We have the finest and best trained fighting force in this Nation's history and they have the most sophisticated and technologically superior military hardware at their disposal. They are resolute in their purpose and we swell with pride in seeing and hearing of their patriotism.

It is our great hope and prayer that this action to drive Iraq from Kuwait will end swiftly and decisively that the men and women of our Armed Forces

will return home soon with the most minimum of casualties.

We salute their professionalism and their bravery and pray for their safety, as we also keep in our prayers and thoughts their families and loved ones here at home. We also pray for wisdom and guidance for our President in his awesome responsibility as Commander in Chief.

IN PRAISE OF ISRAEL'S RESTRAINT

(Mr. DREIER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, as one of my Democratic colleagues said to me last night, "Thank God George Bush is in the position he is as Commander in Chief of our forces."

It is very important for us to recognize a number of developments which have taken place. In June 1981, many people in this country and in other parts of the world criticized our Israeli allies because they went into Baghdad to take out the nuclear facility that Saddam Hussein was building. Well, George Bush has once again demonstrated that he is able to hold this very fragile coalition together. He just a few moments ago in his news conference praised Israel, as we all should, for the restraint they have shown, recognizing that, having been hit themselves, they are not retaliating immediately.

Now I think that we really do need to take our hats off. Many people in this place occasionally bash Israel. We should take our hats off to them for working very closely with us, realizing that 12 of 21 Arab nations have joined in this coalition and to hold that together they must exercise restraint, and I encourage them to continue to do so.

TO EXPRESS SUPPORT FOR U.S. TROOPS IN THE PERSIAN GULF

(Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as Pope John Paul II said yesterday, "War cannot be an instrument for solving problems between nations, and never will be." That, unfortunately, is a stark truth that we must confront daily alongside the now televised reports from the gulf region. The Persian Gulf war in particular will go down in history, I believe, as the war that should never have been. It should have been avoided. I would have been very pleased to see our Government allow more time for the problems to be solved by economic sanctions, diplomacy, and the international courts.

Nonetheless, Mr. Speaker, since we are presently at war, our top priority must be to spur our troops on to victory. The initial stage of this war has showcased our military as a superbly trained and talented force, and they deserve the highest praise for their commitment and patriotism. If we have to be at war, that war has to be fought at the highest degree of both emotional and economic support for our troops so as to insure them as quick a victory as possible.

Although I am not supportive of going to war, I wholeheartedly support each and every one of the men and women in the Persian Gulf theater, as well as our allies. They are doing a tremendous job for all of us, and I wish them a speedy, successful, and an early return to their homes.

THE SILENCE IS DEAFENING

(Mr. RITTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, many of our offices have been picketed by groups described as peace groups, and that is what makes America America. But the American people are asking some very critical questions:

Why have not these same groups picketed the Iraqi Embassy? Why have not they protested Saddam Hussein's brutal invasion of Kuwait? The silence is deafening.

Where is the peace movement in opposing and protesting against that enormous threat to world peace that is embodied in the Soviet reversion to Stalinism and the crushing of the Lithuanian people? Where was the peace movement when 10 years of Soviet genocide was taking place in Afghanistan? Where were the protests? Where is the protest now over Saddam Hussein's launching of missiles against noncombatant Israel, a heinous act taken against civilian populations? The silence is deafening.

Where were they in this Korean Airlines shootdown? Where were they in the crackdown on Solidarity?

Mr. Speaker, the silence is deafening, but the American people are listening for an answer.

HARD TO BELIEVE ONLY 2 DAYS HAVE PASSED

(Mr. CARPER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARPER. It's hard to believe that only 2 days have passed since the hostilities began in the Persian Gulf. It seems to me more than more like 2 weeks, 2 months. I am encouraged; I suspect many of us are encouraged, but I think there is as yet no cause for euphoria. If anything, there may be cause

for optimism, but tempered with a note of caution. The Iraqis are clearly husbanding some of their assets from their lethal assets. Our forces are endeavoring to find and destroy them. They have the ability to still create mischief and, indeed, to create havoc.

Later here today we will praise our troops, the men and women of the U.S. Armed Forces. We will express our gratitude to them and to the allies with whom they fight, and, we should.

We also need to express, as others have today, our gratitude to the Israelis. Not for fighting alongside us, but for showing restraint. The hardest thing for anyone to do in this fracas may be to take a sucker punch, a punch cheaply thrown as they took yesterday, and not to strike back in kind. We appreciate that restraint more than you know. My hope and prayer is that restraint will be continued today and tomorrow and in the weeks, the tough weeks, to come.

ISRAEL DESERVES INTERNATIONAL RESPECT

(Ms. MOLINARI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker, last week I was privileged to be a part of the congressional delegation that ended its trip through the Persian Gulf and Israel. Clearly the beauty of the countryside of this wonderful country is underscored only by the resoluteness and strength of its people.

Let us face it, my colleagues. Last night's attack came as no surprise to the people of Israel, to its military leaders down to almost every one of its citizens. Perhaps the only ones that were ill prepared were the unfortunate casualties, the older woman who struggled and panicked while they put on their gas masks and were forced to suffocate. But the majority of the Israeli citizens have recognized and accepted the international reality that their continued existence depends on their continued courage, and everyone who was with the congressional delegation last week heard Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir encouraged the U.S. Congress to pass the resolution that we passed last week supporting the President of the United States and supporting Resolution 678. They knew what was going to happen, they knew Saddam Hussein would be a man of his word. But they also know that courage takes time and patience.

Mr. Speaker, for that, for the reality that everyone in this world knows Israel is quite capable of defending themselves today, Israel deserves the international respect, support and continued friendship of the United States of America.

□ 1300

FULL SUPPORT URGED FOR TROOPS IN THE PERSIAN GULF

(Mr. LAFALCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, last week, this House engaged in an historic debate. In democratic fashion, we gave our President the authority, if he deemed it wise, to launch a military counteroffensive in order to liberate Kuwait.

Regardless of our personal judgments, we are now confronted with the harsh reality of over 400,000 American men and women engaged in mortal combat. Whenever our troops are committed to battle, all divisions must end. All Americans, and every Member of Congress, must unite to give our troops our full and complete material, moral, and political support, so that we might achieve as swift and decisive a military victory as possible, with a minimum of casualties, on either side, American or Iraqi and so that we can then go on to a just and lasting peace, for all of the people of the Middle East, whether Arab or non-Arab, Palestinian, Jew, or Moslem. Let us hope for that, pray for that, and work for that.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTION CALLING ON SHOW OF SOLIDARITY FOR U.S. TROOPS

(Mr. SHAW asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon, in front of my office in Fort Lauderdale, FL, there was a handful of picketers. They stayed there as long as the photographers were there and as long as the TV cameras stayed, and then they disappeared. But their picture did appear on the front page of our local paper this morning, as they hoped it would.

After leaving my office and the picketers yesterday afternoon, I went to a store front just outside the city of Fort Lauderdale in which some of the bravest men and women I have ever seen in my life were congregated. They were a group that calls themselves Operation Home Front. They are the mothers, the fathers, the sons, the daughters, the sisters, and the brothers of our brave people who are serving now in Saudi Arabia. It occurred to me at that time that we need to show our solidarity with our troops so that very small minority who are picketing and seeking publicity does not steal the entire show and send the wrong message to Saudi Arabia.

I am, therefore, filing a resolution today in which the Congress of the United States calls on all the people of the United States to fly the American flag in a show of solidarity to our

troops in the Persian Gulf. I will be filing this resolution at the end of business today, and I urge any Member who cares to be an original cosponsor of this most important resolution to phone my office sometime before the conclusion of business today.

FULL REPRESENTATION, VOTE URGED FOR CITIZENS OF U.S. INSULAR AREAS

(Mr. DE LUGO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share something with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle here today. Like many other Members, I have just returned from my district. It is a small district. My population is about 120,000 people.

From my district, the Virgin Islands, we have over 200 brave men and women over in the gulf. I want to share with the Members my thoughts last Saturday when that resolution was voted on. I have served in this House for more than 16 years, and never have I regretted not having a vote as much as I did then, because the men and the women who are citizens of the U.S. insular areas, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Northern Marianas, and others, all of whom are serving in Operation Desert Storm, have no vote on the critical question of war and peace. Not only that, but they do not even have a vote on who shall be their President or the man or woman who shall be their Commander in Chief.

Mr. Speaker, I hope Members will help me to rectify this problem, a problem that is indefensible. It is an embarrassment to this great democracy, the greatest democracy in the history of the world. Let us correct this injustice.

NEED FOR ENERGY SECURITY POLICY REEMPHASIZED

(Mr. ALEXANDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. Speaker, the support for the young men and women serving our Nation in the Persian Gulf is absolute, total, and unquestionable.

They have proven beyond doubt that they can handle the job given to them and we are proud of each and every one of them.

The real question we face today is: Can Congress handle its job? Are we willing to take on the difficult job of making this Nation less dependent on oil from the Persian Gulf?

I fear that unless we do so, we will either be forced to permanently station troops in the gulf or send them there

again and again to meet threats to our oil supply.

The best way to show support for our troops is to ensure that they do not have to again hurl themselves into the storm of Middle Eastern politics.

Mr. Speaker, we must begin to look beyond Saddam Hussein, toward the future, a future which will see this Nation less dependent on foreign oil—particularly that coming from the Middle East.

It will be a future in which America will be more secure and more free.

It's no secret that our economic, military, and foreign policies are being driven to an increasing extent by our addiction to oil from the Persian Gulf.

We must set America on a new course which will free us from the tyranny of economic and political manipulation made possible by this addiction.

The sad thing is, Mr. Speaker, we have the capability and technology to become more reliant on our own natural resources by expanding the use of alternate fuels, such as ethanol.

What is lacking, however, is the political will and resolve to make the journey.

But, how can we face the troops now fighting on the sands of the Middle East and say we have not tried, that we were not willing to take even the first step toward energy independence.

I don't believe we can. They deserve more than that.

The U.S. Alternative Fuels Council, of which I am a member, has passed a resolution calling upon the President and the Congress to establish a national energy policy with the goal of displacing U.S. dependence on Persian Gulf oil.

The Council will meet in Denver in mid-February. I invite the Members to participate in that meeting. If they wish to send suggestions to me, I will see that they are incorporated in our recommendations.

The United States once declared its independence from foreign domination. I believe it is time to proclaim a new declaration of independence from a foreign domination made possible by oil.

Let us do something that our men and women in the Persian Gulf will really appreciate. After the victory, let us bring them home.

A NEW AND WELCOME TYPE OF DEMONSTRATION BY FLORIDA STUDENTS

(Mr. YOUNG of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to report on a large demonstration that took place in my district in Florida yesterday directed at the activity of the war effort in the Persian Gulf. Just a short time ago I spoke with Dr. Carl Cutler, the president of the St. Petersburg Community College,

a college with 5 campuses and 57,000 students.

At 11 o'clock yesterday, those campuses came to a halt. The students all stopped and stood with their heads bowed, and they observed 2 minutes of silence in honor of and in support of the Americans serving in the Persian Gulf. Then on each of the campuses a prayer session was held to pray for the safety and security of those Americans in that action.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I am proud of the St. Petersburg Community College and its faculty and its many students and to say that that is the kind of demonstration I would like to see broadcast on all the television networks for the next couple of days to show that the vast majority of people in America want to show support for those Americans who are there, not because they want to be there but because they know that a job needs to be done and they are prepared to do it.

Mr. Speaker, I thank God for those Americans who are willing to stand and make that kind of a statement and that kind of a demonstration in support of the United States and its policies and its sons and daughters serving in the uniform of our Nation.

ADDITIONAL PATIENCE, EVEN MORE RESTRAINT ASKED OF ISRAEL

(Mr. PEASE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, like many of my colleagues, I rise today to condemn Iraq for its attacks on Israel which cannot be justified in civilized society. I also commend Israel for its decision not to retaliate to that attack.

I go beyond that, however, by asking Israel to show additional patience in restraining itself in the future as well. The reality is that there is not very much likelihood that Iraq can inflict significant further damage on Israel. A further reality is that it is very unlikely that Israel in retaliating could inflict much damage on Iraq that is not already being inflicted by United Nations and U.S. forces.

□ 1310

What Israel can do is to inflame an already volatile situation if it chooses to retaliate if there is a future attack. The provocation is great, the temptation is great for Israel to retaliate if more missiles are sent by Iraq to land on Israel. It is a natural reaction that any of us would have.

But nonetheless, I urge Israel to exercise further restraint, not to retaliate just because another missile happens to land in Israel. For Israel to retaliate would vastly complicate the ef-

fort going on now by 400,000 American troops in the Persian Gulf.

Mr. Speaker, on a different subject altogether, let me say the following:

A week ago this body engaged in an historic debate over the authorization of the use of military force in the Persian Gulf in order to force Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait. My colleagues and I were unanimous in our condemnation of Iraq's brutal and unprovoked aggression against its neighbor. We were also united in our belief that Iraq must withdraw from Kuwait.

Despite our agreement on these issues, there were very different opinions over what measures the United States should take to force Iraq out of Kuwait. Many members, myself included, argued against initiating an offensive military action against Iraq at this time. We argued that the economic sanctions, which had been put in place shortly after Iraq invaded Kuwait, had not been given sufficient time to work. We argued that the potential cost of a U.S.-led attack, first in the number of American and allied casualties and second in its economic ramifications, was too great to risk without giving economic sanctions every opportunity to succeed.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, my position did not prevail: Congress authorized the President to use force. On Wednesday, the President began what I hope and pray will be a short operation which will force Saddam Hussein to remove his troops from Kuwait. Despite my opposition to the use of force in the gulf, I want to be unequivocal in my support of our forces in the region. They acted bravely and professionally in carrying out their orders. They have proved, once again, that they are among the very finest men and women this country has to offer.

RECOGNITION FOR THE BALTIC STATES

(Mr. SARPALIUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SARPALIUS. Mr. Speaker, they have no planes, they have no ships, no aircraft carriers, no battleships, no navy, they have no tanks, they have no missiles, but yet they are fighting an army that has everything that I just said. They are fighting an army with rocks, sticks, and the determination for freedom and independence.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage you to listen to not only the cries of the people in Kuwait, but listen to the cries of the people in Lithuania. For the past 50 years every President has never ever recognized the presence of the Soviet Union in Lithuania until now. As our President expresses his leadership in the Persian Gulf, we ask him to show his leadership for the Baltic States and

give them that recognition that they so rightly deserve.

UNDERSTANDING FOR ISRAELI REACTIONS TO ATTACKS BY SADDAM HUSSEIN

(Mr. SMITH of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the mask is off. The brutal, sadistic international criminal terrorist bully of Iraq last night attacked again a non-combatant: First, a country which is not at war with Iraq; second, had no part in this coalition; and third, has been asked by many countries, including ours, to take a low profile and has, in fact, agreed to do so for the last many months, although threatened. And this low profile has cost them the capability to deter an attack on their own country. It has cost them the ability last night to be able to avoid having seven Israelis wounded, four dying from suffocation from gas masks, and the very strong possibility that tonight again they will be attacked.

Those who take this well and ask for restraint are doing so out of concern for the safety of the people of Israel I am sure, and out of concern for the fact that this coalition, currently doing so well against Iraq, not be weakened. But Mr. Speaker, all of the people of this country, this country more than any other, understand what it means to live in fear of others. We have been involved in helping others remove that yoke from their neck over the last 200 years, and if Israel is attacked tonight, and they may very well have to defend themselves and retaliate, I hope nobody misunderstands, that it is not to break the coalition. It is to save lives of the people of Israel. We would do the same, and we have no right to ask them to do anything less for their own people.

SUPPORTING U.S. PRESENCE IN THE PERSIAN GULF

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, January 17, 1991, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) supporting the United States presence in the Persian Gulf.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. CON. RES. 2

Whereas the President of the United States, with the authorization of Congress, has ordered military action against Iraq in an effort to force Iraqi Armed Forces from occupied Kuwait;

Whereas 415,000 men and women of the United States Armed Forces are now involved in armed conflict;

Whereas 158,000 members of the Reserves and National Guard have been called to active duty since August 22 and may become involved in armed conflict; and

Whereas Congress and the American people have the greatest pride in the men and women of the United States Armed Forces and support them in their efforts: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That (a) the Congress commends and supports the efforts and leadership of the President as Commander in Chief in the Persian Gulf hostilities.

(b) The Congress unequivocally supports the men and women of our Armed Forces who are carrying out their missions with professional excellence, dedicated patriotism, and exemplary bravery.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GEJDESON). Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, January 17, 1991, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes to initiate the debate.

Mr. Speaker, the House meets at a moment of history filled with risk—but we meet in a spirit of firm resolve. We meet to close ranks and to express our solidarity and support of the 430,000 American troops, and the soldiers of our coalition partners, who are engaged in hostilities against the forces of Saddam Hussein. We meet today confident in the knowledge that from the crucible of combat America will once again emerge stronger, and hopeful in our prayer that from this conflict our loved ones will be delivered securely home to us.

But we also meet the day after Iraq has launched its second unprovoked attack against a peaceful neighbor in the region. First there was the invasion of Kuwait. Now we see Scud missiles hitting Tel Aviv and Haifa. This is a war with grave consequences for the entire region and the world. That is why our thoughts this afternoon are focused so deeply on the men and women who are standing and fighting on the frontlines.

Already there are countless tales of heroism and valor from this desert war.

Who among us will ever forget the young crewman who stood at attention with tears streaming down his cheeks as his comrades scrambled into their F-18 jets to roar off into that moonless night as the first wave of thunder in the Desert Storm?

Who among us will ever forget the lionhearted wives and husbands; parents and children; friends and fiancées of our troops who gathered together for mutual support? They dried each other's tears, calmed each other's fears, and inspired us all with their true grace under real pressure.

Who among us will ever forget the newsmen—and women—who are risking their lives to bring the world news from the front, even as the bombs were bursting in air?

In every cafe and coffeehouse; every barbershop and bowling alley; in every

home and here in this House, all Americans have turned our hearts to the Persian Gulf. We eagerly await the successful conclusion of this conflict and the swift return home of our troops.

I think it is fair to say that 6 months ago, few of us would have expected that we would be forced to war against Iraq.

But on August 2, 1990, Iraqi Armed Forces, at the order of the dictator Saddam Hussein, attacked, overran, and began terrorizing a tiny and peaceful neighbor, the Emirate of Kuwait.

At the onset of this unprovoked aggression, the Congress, the country, and the world united in opposition to this brutal invasion, and the grievous violations of human rights against the people of Kuwait.

For months, the United States and the world community pursued a policy of political isolation, economic embargo, and quarantine with the hope of convincing Saddam Hussein that his aggression could be ended without further bloodshed. And President Bush committed our Nation to the largest deployment of American service personnel since our involvement in Vietnam.

On November 29, the United Nations imposed a deadline of January 15 by which Iraq would be permitted to relinquish its evil grip on Kuwait peacefully, and through the extension of all diplomatic means. Saddam only dug in deeper. And so the President decided to turn up the heat.

Under our Constitution, the President is not permitted to hold in his hands alone the decision to make war against an enemy. Congress must share in that fateful decision.

Last Saturday—after the longest and perhaps the most eloquent debate in the modern history of the House—the authorization of Congress was given. The days had dwindled down to a precious few for this intractable dictator to leave Kuwait; the majority had spoken.

In my view, the debate that transpired last weekend was Congress at its best. We honestly, honorably, and without partisan rancor aired our differences over whether the commitment to go to war was our wisest course.

But as the Speaker said moments before the Solarz-Michel resolution was adopted, once the majority spoke, it was time to close ranks. For from that debate a majority emerged, and now we proceed to action united. Today's resolution symbolizes the unity we feel on behalf of our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines as they face hostile fire in a faraway land.

The debate is behind us; the battle is upon us, and the victory is before us. All of us would now do well to heed the advice of Napoleon who said, "If you start to take Vienna, take Vienna."

Now that America and its allies have started to emancipate Kuwait, let us emancipate Kuwait.

America is not a nation of conquerors; we are a nation of liberators. We mourn the loss of life. And we especially mourn whatever civilian casualties may occur in Kuwait and Iraq. For these are the innocents who are caught in a cruel cross-fire between a brutal enemy and an enduring principle—the need to enforce the rule of international law.

But even though our hearts are heavy, our cause is clear.

The fact that this resolution is cosponsored by the distinguished minority leader is all the evidence Saddam Hussein needs that today we are one. The greatest strength of our democracy is that, unlike in Baghdad, here the people govern. And on both sides of the aisle, in both Chambers of the Congress, the people support our troops.

We will do everything in our power to aid them in their mission, even as we pray to a Higher Power to bring them home swiftly, safely and successfully when their mission is accomplished.

□ 1320

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to be able to join with our colleagues in this resolution supporting the President and our troops in the Persian Gulf.

Some say that with Operation Desert Storm already begun, a nonbinding declaration of congressional support must be purely a matter of form. But matters of form in a democracy like ours are not to be dismissed lightly.

Yesterday on the floor I criticized an earlier version of a draft of this resolution that emanated, I think, from the other side of the Capitol as containing weak and mealy-mouthed language. Why did I say what I said if, after all, this is just a matter of form? I did so because I believe that what Congress says about Operation Desert Storm is important. I did so because words do matter.

We in Washington, and I mean the Government and the media, are so used to rhetoric, to the use and abuse of the English language to gain political ends, that we have become a bit cynical. But I believe the American people and people all over the world take words more seriously than we do sometimes, and they are right to do so.

In an age when television cameras instantly bring the war to every living room, the sentiments we express also become an instant part of the events in the gulf.

Mr. Speaker, there are real differences about gulf policy in this Chamber. They were eloquently expressed during our debate last week. These differences are not going to go away or be papered over by what we say today. History and the American people will ultimately judge which of our views on gulf policy best reflect American ideals and national interests.

Each of us will be held responsible for the stand he or she took during the debate.

But in this resolution we transcend the real differences we have for the specific purpose of supporting the President and our troops as they engage in battle.

How incomprehensible that must sound to Saddam Hussein, as the majority leader said in a little different way. And that perhaps is one of the distinctions to be made between a democracy and a dictatorship. In a democracy we can have differences openly, often fiercely expressed, and yet, paradoxically, be united. Such a concept is beyond the mind of dictators who confuse conformity with unity.

In this resolution we are telling Saddam Hussein, deep in his bunker, that the real differences we have as Members of Congress with each other are nothing compared to the differences all of us have with him, Saddam Hussein.

The men and women of our Armed Forces are showing the world what they can do, and the very least we can do for the President is to say, "Well done" to our troops and, of course, to the Commander in Chief, President Bush.

Maybe these are only words, but they are words spoken by freely elected Members of a great democratic institution, and that, indeed, makes all the difference.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, on January 16, at 6:30 p.m., the United States and the world watched as the U.S.-led allied forces transformed Operation Desert Shield to Operation Desert Storm. To quote the official confirmation of the commencement of the campaign, "our men and women will be the lightning and thunder of Operation Desert Storm."

The allied liberation of Kuwait has begun. We look to the Middle East with trepidation, with fear and with hope. My colleagues and I came together just 6 days ago and after much debate, we gave our consent to the President for the use of the U.S. Armed Forces for the enforcement of the U.N. resolutions. He is the one who brought the coalition of 28 nations together in defense of international standards and the family of nations. I believe that my colleagues and I owe him his due recognition. It is this coalition which has stood against Saddam Hussein as he continued through 5 months of his occupation of Kuwait, to buildup his forces in defiance of the international community. It is that fragile community of both traditional friends and foes who have stood together against Hussein's aggressions and brutality to defend the principles on which our global community stands. I applaud his leadership, his determination to drive this aggressor from Kuwait and his commitment to the res-

toration of peace and stability to our world community.

Our Armed Forces have now led a magnificent and expertly executed first few hours of this campaign. Our airmen, in conjunction with our allies, have led a massive strike on Iraq and Kuwait. Their expertise and superior ability have been demonstrated in a spectacular fashion. We, as a nation, should be proud. Our troops have sacrificed much already, by leaving the security of their family and friends. We continue to ask them to sacrifice and we owe them the glory and commitment of our men and women at home. We need to demonstrate our support for them and for their campaign. There can be nothing more demoralizing for those who have put their lives on the line than a divided nation. And there can be nothing more disheartening for them than a lack of patriotism at home. We need to counter their commitment with an equally strong commitment to them.

Today, we have the opportunity to voice our support for our troops and for the Commander in Chief who brought our formidable coalition together. Our allied troops are standing together as brave, skilled military professionals on whom the weight of the international community rests. I salute them and I proudly cast my vote today in favor of this resolution commending the leadership of our President and the bravery of our men and women in uniform.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ROWLAND].

Mr. ROWLAND. Mr. Speaker, no one should ever doubt that the cause our military forces are fighting for is just.

They are fighting to protect the freedom, the security, and well-being of our own people and the people of the entire free world.

It is not a matter of "blood for oil." That slogan distracts from the truth. If Saddam Hussein succeeds in seizing control of a substantial percentage of the world's total oil reserves, he can impose his regime of brutality and terror over all the Persian Gulf and much of the world.

It's true our country gets only about 11 percent of its oil from the Middle East. But our economy is tied to the economies of other countries. If their economic lifeline is threatened, our own economy is threatened.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time economic issues have been linked to freedom and liberty. Our war for independence was fought over burdensome taxes that threatened the freedom and security and well-being of the colonists. And it is freedom and security and the well-being of our country and free world that is at stake today in the Middle East.

It is imperative for Americans to come together and back our forces in the Middle East with a unified home front.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD].

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, we in Congress couldn't pick a better time

to show our support for the President. He has just made a tough, and, I believe, a wise decision in the Persian Gulf.

He knew that there would be some in this country who would criticize him harshly.

What he may not have counted on was the eagerness of some to play Presidential politics in the midst of a great national crisis.

I have been following the brief legislative history of this resolution with a great deal of interest.

I recall some of the comments made last weekend, when we voted to authorize the President to use force in the Persian Gulf.

What especially impressed me was the commitment by so many in this body to fully support the President after the vote was taken.

It is one of the great traditions of this Nation that its elected representatives of both parties have so often united behind the President in times of great crisis.

In the space of 1 week, I have watched that great tradition begin to unravel. I have seen it in remarks made to reporters and on television commentaries, and most of all I have seen it in the development of this resolution on the other side of the Capitol.

This resolution is quite rightly enthusiastic in praise of the American troops. They are splendid Americans doing a very tough and dangerous job. And yet this resolution is so tepid in support of their Commander in Chief.

Some reporters have asked me about this. They want to know if it has anything to do with Presidential politics.

Frankly, I do not know.

But for myself, and for many fellow Members, I know that we fully endorse the President's actions, that we consider what he has done courageous and in the best interests of America and of world peace.

That may not be written into the resolution we pass today, but I think the President should know that there are some in this body, on both sides of the aisle, who remained true to their word and true to the great American tradition that politics stops at the water's edge.

The President would like the enthusiastic support of Congress. But I also know he can live without it.

He knows that someone in this world must make the tough decisions, and that as the President of the greatest democratic nation in the world, the burden of leadership falls on his shoulders.

He did what he did because he knew it was the right thing to do. In his speech on Wednesday night, the President quoted a Marine Corps general, Walter Boomer. The general said that there are things worth fighting for.

He was right. It may sound odd, but we are fighting to maintain lasting peace in the world.

This is a perilous new age—an age when nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons have been acquired by nations both large and small, by governments both good and evil.

It is an age when the superpowers may be ending their conflict, and when smaller powers may feel free to settle old scores.

That is just what Iraq has done. Saddam Hussein was the first out of the box.

What has happened is that the nations of the world—led by President Bush—have decided to make an example of Iraq.

We have got to show Saddam, and any other tyrants with similar designs, that they cannot assault and rape and pillage smaller countries and expect to get away with their crimes.

George Bush, other members of the coalition, officials of the United Nations, they all did everything they could through diplomacy to convince Saddam to leave Kuwait. Saddam would not budge. The President was right to move when he did.

I have been encouraged by the early reports of the operation. What impresses me is the President's decision to zero in on Iraqi military and strategic targets and to spare, as much as possible, civilian areas. This restraint makes it clear that America has no intention of abusing its great military might.

I am also deeply impressed by the selfless idealism, high morale, and real professionalism of the American troops. I visited with them in August as part of a congressional delegation. Everything I have seen since then convinces me that America is very fortunate to be able to call on the patriotism of such splendid people.

Our cause is just, and this resolution rightly commends our American troops and their allies—young men and women with the character and courage to brave the rigors of war.

I would have preferred a stronger statement of support for the President. But I am a realist and I know that this resolution is better than no resolution at all.

I hope that my fellow Members will overwhelmingly pass this resolution and thereby give their full support to the brave men and women who are part of Desert Storm.

□ 1300

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution. Let me say that I commend the leadership, our majority leader and the distin-

guished minority leader, for moving this legislation in a timely manner thereby allowing us the opportunity here today to express our full, strong, and complete support, as well as our deepest appreciation to the men and women who are serving in the Armed Forces, and to their leadership for what they are doing and accomplishing during the course of their implementation and completion of our current military operations. Such that the Congress can send this message to the President when requested.

In my view, it is very important that we express our thanks at this point, in order to show, as has already been pointed out by a previous speaker, that although we had differences of opinion on how we got to this point, we are, nevertheless, united in support of our men and women in the Armed Forces and the accomplishment of the objectives which have been agreed to by both the President and the Congress. I think this is very important. It shows the strength of the democratic process and the strength of our own country. It shows that despite our differences of opinion, we can unite together. I know that I would not want to go as far as saying that everything should be in lockstep. I know that I would not go as far as saying that all differences of opinion should end at the waterfront. Even in war, there are legitimate cases and times where there may be serious differences that ought to be expressed and be aired, but they are done and should be done in the context of what a democratic society is all about. There should be no misunderstanding on the part of anybody else who is looking in on our families and processes.

After all, the freedom of expression is but one strength of our society and our democratic process. It is a strength that other people aspire to and cannot do it. Can Members imagine expressing a dissenting voice in Iraq? A person would not express it very long. If they did, they would be a dead duck. Therefore, Members should not be too timid in expressing differences of opinion. At the same time, Members should recognize, as we do in this resolution, that as a people, once we take a stand, with respect to what we value as to what we are willing to fight for, that we stand united in doing so. I think it is essential that this resolution be adopted and adopted unanimously regardless of whether Members voted for or against the consent to use military force that the President requested.

I would like to add one final thought on this matter. The question now arises, that with the two attacks on two independent countries, leaves little doubt in my mind, and this is a personal opinion, of the intentions of Saddam Hussein. I do not ask any Member to agree with me. But as far as the dictator of Iraq is concerned, not only was

his mind made up, and not only is he not going to give up easily, this war is not over tomorrow. The other shoe has yet to fall. The Iraqis have considerable military capabilities that have yet to be deployed or utilized. Additional Iraqi military action will be taken and that is why this resolution is so important. This war will not be over tonight. This war will not be a 2-day or a 2-week or a 2-month affair. I do not know how long it will be. I can only reexpress the words of the President: That we shall continue in our efforts until our objectives are achieved. And, that the implementation of these objectives are being pursued by the men and the women who are on the front lines. It is our duty to support them in that effort.

Members should not be misled about what has happened so far, which in my opinion has gone extremely well. This is a difficult mission for the United States, and for the men and women who are out there at the front lines. At the same time, Members should keep in mind the attack that was carried out on another democracy today, and be grateful that the people of Israel have the courage, resiliency, and determination to resist the immediate desire to retaliate. As a sovereign nation, Israel has the right to self-defense. Nevertheless, they have showed remarkable and courageous restraint thus far in order to allow the international coalition to go on and get the job that has been done, done. They do so because they are satisfied that we are doing a job that they can do. At the same time, and make no mistake about it, they have reserved the right to respond, and they should reserve the right to do whatever is necessary to protect their own people.

That being said, we are here today to express the great admiration that we have, the thanks that we express, and the hopes and prayers we have for our men and women and their families all over this country, for the sacrifices they are making on our behalf. I am happy and proud to support this resolution and I am sure my colleagues are, too. Mr. Speaker, I urge the unanimous adoption of this resolution.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to lend my strong support to the Michel-Gephardt resolution commending and supporting the leadership and efforts of our President as our Commander in Chief, and proclaiming the unequivocal support of the Congress for the 415,000 brave men and women of our Armed Forces involved in armed conflict.

Mr. Speaker, over the past week, we have all been glued to our TV sets intently observing the fast moving events over the past few days. What

has been most impressive to all of us is the courageous manner and excellent competence of our brave men and women fulfilling their responsibilities in our Armed Forces. Clearly, our Armed Forces are the cream of the crop. Our men and women represent the best trained force that our Nation has seen. Our hearts swell with pride when we see how impeccable and effective their performance has been.

Unfortunately, there is a sad note in any conflict. We all hope and pray that our casualties will be at an absolute minimum. Our deepest sorrow goes out to the families who have lost loved ones in this conflict.

We pray too that Saddam Hussein will soon see the light and abandon his brutal stance, turning toward peace.

As we support this resolution, our thoughts and prayers have been and will continue to be with our brave men and women of our Armed Forces serving our Nation in the Persian Gulf, dedicated to bringing freedom to the people of Kuwait.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA].

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I quote from the first paragraph of the resolution:

The Congress unequivocally supports the men and women of our Armed Forces who are carrying out their missions with professional excellence, dedicated patriotism and exemplary bravery.

My personal link to this endeavor is Lt. Cmdr. Jorge de la Garza, USN, and Lt. Michael de la Garza, USN. Mike was in the Mediterranean Sea and took part in the Libya operation a few years ago. Jorge served as a base surgeon in Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and is now a surgeon with the Marines at the front in Saudi Arabia. My provincial link is all the men and women in the Reserves who have been called into the service, and the 141st Infantry Texas National Guard that is now on active duty at Fort Hood, TX. My collective interest is all our men and women, many of whom I have seen personally while in the Middle East, and all who support their mission here and abroad.

Therefore, I say to them that we are proud of you. We are so very proud of you. We support you. Our prayers are with you. For that reason, I will support strongly this resolution, and urge all my colleagues, to do likewise regardless of their previous stance. This is what we say to those who are in the front lines in our behalf.

□ 1340

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLO].

Mr. GALLO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished minority leader for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution which reinforces our support

for President Bush and the other leaders of the international coalition at this critical time of war.

War is not an option that any of us would choose, if there were any viable alternatives available to us.

But, given the alternatives that we faced in this situation, I feel strongly that the evidence pointed toward support for action.

Any time you send young men and women into harm's way, it is a difficult decision.

I believe that President Bush, Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney and Joint Chiefs' Chairman Colin Powell deserve the heartfelt thanks of all Americans for choosing a course of action designed to maximize the damage to military targets, while minimizing the number of both military and civilian casualties.

Because of these measured actions, which show our concern for our own people and for the civilian population, I believe that we have made it clear that we are not at war with the Iraqi people.

Our fight is with Saddam Hussein.

As that fact becomes increasingly clear within Iraq and the Arab world, Saddam Hussein may find that he has a lot fewer supporters than he thinks.

Because of the high standard of professionalism and self-discipline being exhibited by our Armed Forces, we have been able to successfully translate our overall strategy into effective tactical responses.

Under the effective leadership of Gen. Norman Schwarzkopf, our forces have stayed focused on their missions and have not deviated from the plan.

The dedication and bravery of our young men and women, many of whom are facing enemy fire for the first time is very impressive to me and is reason for us to feel a great sense of pride in our military—for their humanity as well as for their determination.

There may be difficult days ahead, but we can take comfort in the fact that we are pursuing this course with professionalism and self-determination.

As a democracy, we are never comfortable with a decision to go to war, even when we firmly believe that it is the only realistic option available to us.

In that sense, our vote last week giving the President the power to take us into war was the most difficult vote I have ever cast, even though I had no doubt in my mind as to how I would vote.

My vote today in support of our young men and women in the gulf is also an expression of my hopes for an early and successful conclusion to this conflict and a more peaceful world to follow.

Our prayers go out for those who are missing in action and for a successful

conclusion of our engagement, so that our forces can come home.

Mr. Speaker, I support the resolution.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 2.

I strongly support the President and our fighting forces in this moment of trial. This is a conflict Saddam Hussein has brought upon himself, as if he were determined to have war. It was he who started this conflict. It is we who will finish it. Unfortunately, the people of Iraq will pay the price of Saddam's aggression and intransigence. For 5½ months, the United States and the world tried to resolve this crisis peacefully. All diplomatic initiatives were rebuffed. Regretfully, but necessarily, we must now resort to force to liberate Kuwait.

I voted in support of the Solarz-Michel resolution because I realized economic sanctions would not dislodge Saddam Hussein from Kuwait. They were working, but would not work. I believed that the last best chance for peace was the threat of war. Yet, Saddam Hussein continued to ignore even the risk of his own destruction, intent on his delusion of Arab leadership. Wednesday night, I think he finally realized his miscalculation. Sadly, he has sacrificed the lives of thousands because of the immensity of his own ego.

The United States has committed itself to war. In this endeavor, the Congress and the people of this great Nation stand together and solidly behind our Armed Forces. Our vote today will demonstrate just how clear that support is. My concern now is for the safe return of our young men and women. Today, my heart goes out to the families of those with loved ones in the Persian Gulf. I pray that this conflict will be short and casualties will be few.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WYLIE].

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for giving me this time to say how truly proud I am of our President and to express my admiration for his courage in doing what had to be done to force Saddam Hussein from Kuwait. I would also commend Secretary Baker who has traveled so many miles and gave so much tireless effort to talk to leaders of other nations. He and the President and Secretary Cheney did everything humanly possible to persuade Saddam Hussein that he should not force us to go to war. President Bush went the extra mile, and another extra mile. Saddam Hussein has willingly made a choice to engage in armed hostilities. It is tragic that the situation has deteriorated to where it has and I know, personally, deciding to go to war was

not something President Bush did without prayerful soul-searching. But, there are times when we must fight for peace. Saddam Hussein chose to ignore the warnings of the President, the Congress, and the United Nations and now his country is paying a terrible price.

I want to express my deepest respect, highest admiration and support for our brave men and women participating in Operation Desert Storm. I am impressed by the obvious degree of readiness, professionalism and training of our military. These are indeed, America's cream of the crop. Their leaders are highly responsible and perhaps the best the world has ever seen. They, obviously have formulated thoughtful, thorough plans designed to minimize United States and Iraqi civilian casualties. Our troops and their families are making tremendous sacrifices to stop Hussein's aggression. Some, I am saddened to say, have made the ultimate sacrifice with their lives, and our prayers go out to their loved ones. I am satisfied that it is because of the selflessness and heroism of these gallant men and women that future generations of Americans will find the world a safer and better place in which to live and rear their children.

The President and our troops deserve the unwavering backing of this Congress and the American people. We all wish our troops Godspeed and hope that they can return home safely and soon. This resolution leaves no doubt of our resolve and I strongly support it.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR].

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of our fine men and women of our armed services, and I pray that the President will use his judgment well. I pray that he will do everything possible to end the bloodshed as soon as possible. I pray that he will attempt to bring people together in our country and the global community.

I met many of the American troops in December in the desert. They are decent, they are patriotic, dedicated, and self-sacrificing. They are bright and intelligent. They are our youth, the hope of all our tomorrows. They are truly our "profiles in courage."

Let us as a Congress dedicate ourselves to the value of life, of their American lives and the American lives lost and injured, the British lives lost and injured, the Italian lives lost and injured, the Kuwaiti lives lost and injured, and the Israeli lives lost and injured, and yes, the Iraqi lives lost and injured.

Let us rededicate ourselves to peace and an end to the anxiety with which the entire world is experiencing, and let us as a Congress rededicate ourselves to give these American soldiers a sound country to come back to; let us work for a sound economy, a national energy policy, full health care, full em-

ployment, and a decent quality of life for all.

We as a Congress can do better for them and we owe this to our soldiers and, indeed, we owe this to the American people.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN].

□ 1350

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, this body met a week ago to debate our differences with respect to the President's authority to commit American troops to combat. Today we meet on another somber occasion to express what I expect to be our strong support for our troops in Operation Desert Storm.

Regardless of our votes last Saturday, each Member of this House shared one overriding concern—the welfare of American men and women in the Persian Gulf.

From what has transpired to date in Operation Desert Storm, it has been confirmed that our service men and women are highly professional and are dedicated to their country and to the cause of peace. There can be no question, regardless of our earlier votes, that these individuals must have the explicit support of the American people through this action of the Congress. Let us say to them that we are extremely proud of your commitment to the job the world is resolved to see accomplished and we wish you Godspeed in your important mission.

And to our President, I wish to add that I am grateful for your pledge to conclude this operation quickly with a minimum of human suffering. I am thankful that you have directed our technologically superior military arsenal to kill weapons and not people. I pray that this strategy will be successful, for we do not desire to harm innocent citizens of Iraq and we wish for the safety of members of the American and allied armed forces.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I thank you for convening the House to afford us the opportunity to express our unwavering gratitude and pledge our support for our brave men and women in the Persian Gulf.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI].

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, hiding in his basement bunker, Saddam Hussein may believe that the American Air Force is his principal problem, or he may have concluded the Navy and its cruise missiles are the major threat. In truth, it is neither. The ultimate demise of Saddam Hussein lies in the seamless web of 250 million Americans, resolute, united, determined, and speaking with a common voice and ordering but one command from this capital to every ship, every aircraft, and every army unit: "End this menace, win this war, restore the peace that the

world and all of its people so richly deserve."

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RINALDO].

Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 2.

Mr. Speaker, my admiration for the bravery of the American men and women fighting to liberate Kuwait knows no bounds.

This morning, we saw pictures of the most amazing precision bombing in history. As more details are revealed, it becomes ever more clear that President Bush made the right decision in engaging Iraq, and that Congress' vote last Saturday to support that policy was correct.

If there were any doubt about our course, it was erased last night by Iraq's cowardly attack on innocent civilians in Israel.

While our planes have carefully targeted military installations, Saddam Hussein went after women and children.

While our pilots were told not to attack unless they could be absolutely sure of where their bombs would land, Iraq indiscriminately blew up apartment buildings.

Furthermore, last night's missiles could just as easily have contained nerve gas.

We are dealing with a man who has made the development of nuclear weapons a major priority. If he had possessed them last night, thousands and thousands would have died. If we don't stop him now, he will continue to develop his nuclear capability and will not hesitate to use it.

Our servicemen are showing amazing bravery in carrying out their missions. The precision of the bombing under such fire is proof of our pilots' dedication, courage and skill. The low number of aircraft lost is a tribute to the planning and execution of this operation.

In addition, our allies and their Armed Forces deserve our thanks. Finally, I want to pay tribute to the brave people of Israel, who have faced an unprovoked attack and had the strength to withhold an immediate response.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN].

Mr. MCMILLAN of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise in unqualified support of our brave service men and women stationed in the Persian Gulf.

I congratulate President Bush, as our Commander in Chief, for securing the support of our allies to drive Saddam Hussein from Kuwait. While many in this Chamber disagreed on how to reach a peaceful resolution to this crisis, I believe now is the time for all to unify in support of our President and the troops now fighting in the gulf.

Mr. Speaker, over 18 percent of all the troops participating in Operation Desert Storm are permanently based in North Carolina.

No one enters into war lightly, particularly those with much to lose. That is why I am heartened by the support for the President's actions by so many of the residents of North Carolina.

It is important, as we seek to establish a new world order, that we are not deterred by the dangerous actions of a ruthless dictator. We seek a world based on the laws of reason, not on the laws of the jungle.

A young second lieutenant from North Carolina recently wrote that "there are reasons to fight." He fully supported the President, and I believe that the Congress can do no less.

It is unfortunate that the world community has had to resort to force to remove Iraq from its defenseless neighbor. We will not lose, and we shall not waiver in our commitment to bring about a world where peace exists without the constant threat of war.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday this Congress exhibited a strength of our democracy; we disagreed openly and fairly and then we voted.

The majority spoke, and today we exhibit the unity of purpose that is also the hallmark of a nation that follows a democratic system of government and also is unified in its desire to remove tyranny from the Middle East. There is only one valid purpose for this resolution today, and that is to eliminate any doubt about the support of Congress and the American people for our troops in the Middle East.

We are letting both those who wage this battle in the Persian Gulf and our President who leads them know today how unified we are behind their common efforts.

These troops are faced with a tough job, but we are confident of their skill, their training and their commitment.

Let there be no question of our own commitment or support for those men and women whose bravery and dedication we pray will carry them through this battle and return them from their missions and eventually, safely home.

There has been a great deal of optimism, perhaps even the term euphoria should be used, about the fight we have already waged and, mistakenly, I fear, the fight that lies ahead.

There are many difficult and bitter times before us. We will not succeed in dealing with them unless we deal with them together as a nation. Today's vote is an effort to show that unity among a Congress that, while divided on many issues, is together in the support of the men and women who have volunteered to do this difficult job.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. MCCANDLESS].

Mr. MCCANDLESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in total support of our troops in

the Persian Gulf. I commend them for the job they are doing.

The Congress and the Nation must stand united behind those men and women and give them our fullest measure of support.

Our thoughts and prayers are with them and with their families.

I also want to commend the Government and the people of Israel.

Saddam Hussein's unprovoked attack on Israeli population centers had no military value. It was nothing less than a high-level terrorist act.

Until the attack, Israel was not a party to the conflict.

Despite a very real danger, and open threats by the Iraqi Government, Israel—at the request of the United States Government—refrained from preemptive strikes.

That restraint made them vulnerable to last night's missile attack. However, preparation and the bravery of the Israeli people kept casualties to a minimum.

Our troops as a part of the combined forces of the United Nations have a very difficult task. We must give them our full support.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate those who have drafted this resolution for putting forward one that can be very broadly supported. It gives those of us who share in the overwhelming admiration and gratitude we have for our fighting forces a chance to say so. But it does not, as it should not, suspend the principles of democracy and the Constitution which obligate us to debate policy where we continue to differ.

And I want to talk about one of the differences that most bothers me.

We have Israel showing enormous restraint at the request of the United States, taking a hit from a vicious thug, when it would ordinarily have prevented it. Now we have people saying that we in the United States should tell the Israelis not to defend themselves. Why? Because we cannot offend the coalition.

We have got the rest of the world to where they have read "Tom Sawyer" and they understand how to get America to paint their fences.

Not only do we do all of the dangerous and dirty work, we are supposed to be grateful to them for letting us do it.

Why doesn't the coalition worry about offending us? What are the Saudis and Kuwaitis going to do if they get mad? Tell us to stop defending them? Are we doing the Egyptians some disservice by being over there to defend them against a vicious dictator?

The notion that because we have put ourselves, our young people, our resources at risk to defend people against Saddam Hussein, who is a threat di-

rectly to a lot of people but not to the United States directly, we somehow act as if by their letting us do this we are obligated to them and we have therefore to tell the Israelis that they should sit by and be hit and hit.

□ 1400

Mr. Speaker, the Israeli Government has not only the right in my judgment, but the obligation to defend itself against this kind of aggression, and those in this coalition who tell us that they blame America, and it will be our fault, and we will move away from this coalition—this is a coalition most of whose members give us ice in the winter, this is a coalition which consists largely, apparently, of feelings about to be hurt—ought to be told that we will do the right thing and recognize the right of Israel to legitimate self-defense.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON].

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to associate myself with my boss, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] describing this extraordinary quality of the American people to dissent, disagree and then to pull together again.

However, Mr. Speaker, now we have a job to do, and I suggest we get at it without further words.

Of course we support our President. Of course we support our allies. Of course we support the families of those in the Armed Forces. And of course, particularly we support those extraordinary men and women who are over there defending us with their lives.

Of course we can do no less.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HAYES].

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I returned today from Chicago to cast my vote on this resolution, because I realize the grave importance of our troops in the Middle East.

I am utmostly in support of our troops in the Middle East because I truly value their lives, and want to see an immediate end to this conflict so that no additional lives are snuffed out. I am in support of our brave young men and women, yet I am torn about how to vote on this resolution today. I am torn because this resolution does not really exclusively express our support for the troops, but instead glorifies the President's decision to place our troops at risk. I could not support the President's actions last week and cannot support them today by saying, "amen, you are right Mr. President."

This is not a vote that questions one's patriotism, because I know that I am just as patriotic as any of my colleagues in this Chamber. However, we need to be honest about the intention of this resolution. We all know that

this measure will carry overwhelming support here in the House. We also know that the media will tout these results all over the world as clear support for the President's actions. I must make a clear distinction in my position. I do not support the President's actions in the Persian Gulf and never will. I refuse to sanction more deaths. I will not contradict myself. However, I will never abandon my support for our troops, nor for the death of innocent human beings whether they are American, Israeli, or Arab. Everyone is entitled to the right to life.

So, I fully understand that this effort today is really much more cosmetic than truly meaningful because we all know that support for our troops is a given. My position is clear, I adamantly oppose this war, I believe our No. 1 priority should be the preservation of human life and I call for the President to immediately initiate serious negotiations so that there will be peace in the Middle East.

Let not our course of continued action be determined by partisan politics nor whether or not our so called experts save face in an effort to prove their decision right. Let right over wrong lead us to end this war.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON].

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 3. Like many of my colleagues, I have taken great pride in being a strong supporter of the administration and this President's handling of this situation in the Middle East since August 2. I have also taken great pride as a member of the Committee on Armed Services to support in both words and votes the tools and resources and equipment necessary to protect and benefit those brave, young military personnel currently serving in the gulf, as well as their dependents back home.

Last week's debate in this body and the discussion on Capitol Hill and around the world was democracy at its best, allowing Members to disagree, yet allowing us all to come together, in the final analysis, to respect the will of the majority. Some perhaps, however, would misread our democracy, would misread our debate and our public right of free expression of speech and dissent.

Mr. Speaker, I will give two cases in point as examples. I watched an interview this week with Mu'ammar Qadhafi as he tried to misinterpret what was happening in our democracy as evidence this country was not behind our President or not behind our troops, and I heard the poignant story of one of our front line military personnel who wondered what was happening back home as he saw the demonstrations in our cities and wondered whether or not we

were united behind his actions and behind his efforts as a person.

Let this vote make it crystal clear, Mr. Speaker, to the soldiers in the Middle East, to Mu'ammar Qadhafi, to the world and, yes, to Saddam Hussein, that we are united as one nation in our support of our troops, and our President, and our resolve to free Kuwait and end the domination of Saddam Hussein.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL].

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, let me rise in support of our dedicated men and women now serving our Nation in the Persian Gulf and join with their families and their loved ones in praying for their safe return to the United States, and I promise that this Congress will show the Nation's appreciation for the sacrifices that they have made.

When this sensitive and important issue was debated in this House of Representatives, it made the Nation, and indeed the Members, so proud, not because of the eloquence, but because of the nonpartisan way in which this matter of conscience was debated. I said then, "I don't see how you could oppose the President on moral and conscientious grounds, yet support this military initiative."

As one who was one of the first to go to Korea to serve in combat for a year, to leave with frozen feet, a Purple Heart and a Bronze Star, I make it abundantly clear that I take a back seat to nobody in terms of patriotism. As one who is a father of a service person and who represents a community that has made more than their share of sacrifices in Grenada, in Panama, in Vietnam and now in the Persian Gulf, I reserve the right to oppose our policies in the Persian Gulf and at the same time make it abundantly clear that we support the courage of our men and women who find themselves in this situation today.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY].

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, like all of my colleagues in the Congress, the loved ones of many of my constituents stand in harm's way as part of the United Nation's coalition forces now engaged in Operation Desert Storm.

The sons and daughters of many others, including Marine Corps Pvt. Steven Scott Carrow, the son of one of my staff members, are due to be dispatched to the war zone in the coming weeks.

We, as their elected representatives, have the moral obligation to give them, and their Commander in Chief, President Bush, our unequivocal support. Any sign of weakness, uncertainty, or division in this Chamber will serve to strengthen the resolve of Saddam Hussein to continue his insane military aggression in Kuwait, Saudi

Arabia, and Israel; and it also will serve to undermine the morale of our brave sons and daughters.

I call upon my colleagues to stand above politics and voice their unequivocal support for President Bush, for our sons and daughters and the sons and daughters of our allied nations in Operation Desert Storm. We should vote out a resolution that states our unequivocal support, but we will not have that opportunity. Unfortunately, politics has become involved. However, I still urge my colleagues to vote for this irresolute resolution.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO].

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, during last week's fateful debate, we all drew heavily upon the lessons of history. I drew the conclusion that continued unyielding sanctions would best achieve our mutually desired objectives: Sovereignty of nations, rule of law, diplomatic resolution of conflicts, and the restoration and preservation of peace.

Others, the majority, drew different conclusions and followed a more familiar path with a call to arms.

But now in the sober moments as our first casualties come home let us look again to history and make this firm resolution:

No matter what our earlier views, no matter how profound our concern about the wisdom of this policy, we will not forsake our young men and women in the gulf; we will cherish them, pray for their safe return and an early and successful resolution of this conflict; we will support their families in this time of need; we will welcome them home with open arms and honor their sacrifice. And when these veterans return home we will not neglect and forget them as we have so many veterans of past wars.

War is the result of failed diplomacy. But that should not deter the President from continuing to seek a diplomatic resolution to this conflict, even as he prosecutes the war.

I want us to make one other resolution: That for the sake of expediency, the United States will never again aid or abet a bloody dictator in his rise to power; that we will be determined to make long-term changes in our foreign policy that will create a true new world order of lasting peace.

□ 1410

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BAKER].

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, 6 days ago, Saturday, January 12, this House voted, 250 yeas to 183 nays, to adopt a mirror resolution of the U.N. Security Council, Resolution No. 668. No one wanted war. No one wanted to put any lives at risk unreasonably, but Saddam did not listen.

Fortunately for us, this President will not turn his head to naked aggression. This President authorized military strategists and professionals to develop a plan which would effectively remove Saddam's forces from Kuwait. Fortunately, this President had the courage and foresight over past sessions to ask this Congress to make sure the United States was not only militarily prepared but that it is competent to overcome any force that threatens freedom on this globe. Fortunately for us, this President is now standing firm and resolute. He will not yield until Saddam says he will withdraw and comply with U.N. Resolution 668.

It is, indeed, appropriate and timely that this House, divided 6 days ago, should now come together in unanimous support for what is the most important statement for freedom the world has seen. We must join together. We must not turn our backs on our troops. The President is right. Our men and women are professionals. This Congress can do no less than this.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 2.

Last weekend we decided that Congress was going to fulfill its responsibility under the Constitution to declare war. That has now been done. We are now at war. We have shown our feelings about the responsibility concerning this constitutional requirement.

Our leadership on both sides of the aisle has asked us to pass this particular resolution. The resolution speaks of our love and affection, our confidence, and our thanks to our men and women in the service and to our Commander in Chief. I join enthusiastically in doing all the things this resolution provides.

I particularly congratulate the quality of our Commander in Chief, a man of vision, a man of compassion, and a man of decision.

Now, today we are somewhat confronted in this country with people who are what we call peace activists. I would suggest that those peace activists might well show their best vision for the future by combining themselves with the idea of a new world order in the United Nations, and also by not demonstrating before the White House but instead by demonstrating in front of the Iraqi Embassy.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW].

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, this provides that the Congress supports the efforts and the leadership of the President as Commander in Chief in the Persian Gulf hostilities, that the Congress unequivocally

cally supports the men and women of our Armed Forces who are carrying out their mission with professional excellence, dedicated patriotism, and exemplary behavior.

Mr. Speaker, we can do no less than to pass this resolution, and we must do it with enthusiasm and almost unanimous support. This will allow a unified Congress and a unified America to send a message to our brave men and women in the Persian Gulf that America is with them. This resolution will send a message across this great country to the loved ones and the families of our men and women in the Persian Gulf, some of the bravest people I have ever known, that America is with them. And, yes, Mr. Speaker, this resolution will send the clearest of messages to Iraq that we are not Democrats, we are not Republicans, we are Americans all, and we will win. Make not mistake about it, we are unified, and we are determined and we will win.

Mr. Speaker, we made many mistakes in Vietnam, but perhaps the greatest mistake we ever made was in taking so long to recognize the bravery, the excellence, and the gratitude of this country to the service men and women who gave so much to us in Vietnam. But make no mistake about it, now America is unified. America is back.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HOAGLAND].

Mr. HOAGLAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to our men and women in the gulf. Their competence and bravery stand as a shining example of those who would defend freedom, and oppose aggression everywhere in the world.

I also rise to pay tribute to the brave citizens of Israel. The Israelis have endured incredible hardship and incomprehensible pressure over the last four decades, and specifically and over the last several hours—as we have asked them to absorb a first strike. Imagine how we would feel today if our children and elderly, our spouses and our parents, were the targets of Saddam Hussein's horrible arsenal—and threatened with a frightening array of chemical and biological weapons.

Israel is an outpost of democracy in the Middle East. And we as a nation, owe the people of Israel, a debt of gratitude for helping us keep an unprecedented coalition of nations together against Hussein's evil aggression.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, last evening I spent time with many parents and friends of our service men and women who are overseas in the Persian Gulf. They were gathered as part of a very impressive local community support group that reaches out and provides

support to families of our troops in Operation Desert Storm.

One woman, a leader of the group, was a mother who had already lost one son in an automobile accident—her other son is now serving in the Middle East. With pride and conviction she told me a good deal about the pain of losing a child—and then what it means to send a child into a combat zone. The remarkable thing is that she fully supports our action in the Persian Gulf and is encouraging others.

We have so many wonderful Americans supporting our brave young people now in harm's way. Overwhelmingly Americans are accepting the responsibility of world leadership and standing up for the principles on which this great Nation was founded.

Mr. Speaker, as I traveled in southwest Florida these past few days, holding town meetings and listening to my constituents, I was honestly struck by the level of commitment to backing our troops.

Everywhere I went, people of all ages and all political beliefs told me that it is time to pull together as a nation behind our troops, our allies, and our President.

From middle school students in Sarasota, to disabled vets in Naples, to parents and spouses of members of the Armed Forces in every community, and even to conscientious objectors who took the time to listen to me and share their views—whether they agreed with the decision to use force or not—the support for our people fighting in the Middle East was unwavering.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of my district—and I am proud to stand here today and add my unequivocal support for our troops and our President.

□ 1420

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SAVAGE].

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, I was not a Member of this body when the Gulf of Tonkin resolution was unanimously adopted, but I was a Member when this same body expressed by majority vote its regret, considering that the Tonkin resolution was wrong in hindsight.

Well, I am opposed to this resolution, if I stand alone, because if the plan was wrong, and I argued and voted against Bush's plan last week, if the plan is wrong, then the execution is wrong.

For instance, if you are opposed to capital punishment, you cannot say you are opposed to it until someone is convicted and put on death row, and say, OK, go ahead with the execution. If you are against the plan, you must be against the execution, to be consistent.

Let me also add, I hear here people debating, talking about the few civilians that were harmed or killed in Israel last night. But I tell you, what about the civilians in Baghdad? We are

all God's children, or we none are. We are all equally so.

Incidentally, when we talk about, and I think it was terrible, wrong, that Iraq would bomb Israel, but let us not forget that a few years ago Israel bombed Iraq. Where were all the expressions of moral indignation at that time in this body?

We talk about the heroism of the Lithuanians, fighting against the military might of the Soviet Union with rocks and sticks and what have you. Are not the Palestinians doing the same thing in the Gaza Strip and on the West Bank?

Let us be fair and evenhanded in this matter. I tell you, the problem cannot be solved in the Middle East by America's military might, because the problem is not just using force trying to enforce peace. There cannot be peace without justice. Justice is a prerequisite to peace. The military might must be on the side of bringing justice to the Middle East.

We need to bring our resources back home to provide justice in this country for African-Americans. This resolution I cannot support, because it commends the President. I cannot say this, when we said the opposite last week, that I commend and support the President.

I support our young men and women, the military in the Middle East, but the way to express that support best is to demand that they be brought back home immediately. The way to do that is to vote against this resolution.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH].

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the President for his superb leadership of the crisis in the Persian Gulf, also our brave young service men and women need to know how very proud we are of them. They are carrying out their missions with courage and professionalism. My thoughts and prayers are always with them and their families and let us not forget that these service men and women are members of an All Volunteer Force dedicated to fighting for freedom and are truly patriots.

From all accounts, we look strong and the outlook is encouraging. This is due, in part, to the brilliant planning of the President and his very able military advisers and commanders. I wish them continued success in the upcoming days.

I am also encouraged by the performance of those weapons which have never been tested in battle before. As you may know, my district in Nevada is the home base of the Stealth fighter. I understand that the stealth technology performed exactly as designed, and I am pleased with its initial performance.

I truly hoped that we would see a peaceful end to this hostility started by Saddam Hussein. No one wanted

this war to occur, but the fact is we are at war, and we now must focus on driving Hussein out of Kuwait and getting our forces home as soon as possible.

God bless President Bush, and our troops, and God bless America.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. BOXER].

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, my vote today will show my support for the troops.

War has begun, and now our focus is clear, how to bring our service men and women home, to be reunited with their families, with a minimum number of casualties, and with a minimum number of innocent victims of war.

My heart is with those brave American troops and with their families, whom I speak to almost every day, and my heart will remain there until this war ends.

Mr. Speaker, I call on Saddam Hussein not to sacrifice his people in a futile battle against the most awesome force ever assembled.

My heart is also with the people of Israel, and I condemn the Iraqi attack on that country. Israel's restraint has been remarkable. That restraint indicates their strength.

As for opposition in this country, whether it is 10 percent of the people, or 20 percent, or 1 percent, let us continue to allow our people to express themselves peacefully, no matter what side they are on. That is the strength of this Nation.

Let us also ensure that our brave news correspondents do not face censorship as they attempt to inform the American people.

Finally, lasting peace in an area of the world plagued by war must be our goal, and I pray and I pray that the costs of this war will not echo in our country for too long, so that we can move America forward in peace and in unity.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN].

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Speaker, when bombs burst in air and an Arabian desert landscape is illuminated by the rockets' red glare, there ought to be certain things which are self-evident. I thought until a few moments ago that one of them was that when American forces were under these circumstances, by authority of the majority vote of the elected representatives of the American people, that all Americans would be united in support of those troops. I hope that if there are any of us who are not, they will be mercifully very few.

Events of the last 2 days have demonstrated the incredible technology brought to bear in the Middle East by American forces. But those weapons, that technology, operate only through the skills, the dedication, the training, the professionalism, of an All Volun-

teer American Force. We have never fielded a finer one. We should be eternally grateful to them. Our thanks and our prayers are with them.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BYRON].

Mrs. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, the resolution before this House today expresses congressional support for the President's leadership and for our troops in the gulf. The passage of this resolution could not be more timely. By our action today, only 3 days into a struggle of undetermined duration, Congress sends an unmistakable message to the world. Last week we debated and voted. Today we are one. This message should be music to the ears of our troops. The men and women who have served in Desert Shield for the past several months have done so with a certain measure of fear. A fear that this Nation will not fully support their efforts. Time and time again they have asked will there be support. I sincerely hope that our troops after this debate, understand where we stand. I would also like to commend our personnel in the gulf, Active Duty, Reserve, and Guard on their outstanding efforts thus far.

We were quick to take action to remedy initial concerns about health and welfare, mail service, imminent danger pay, medical professional pay, and variable housing allowance for Reservists. As Desert Shield unfolded, it has become clear that more fine tuning of benefits and policies is needed. Now that Desert Shield has become Desert Storm, the need to act has taken on a new urgency.

As was the case previously, the focus of this legislation is on updating special pays, and protecting financial equity for Active and Reserve members. The bill would: Increase family separation pay, certain places pay, and the death gratuity, and extend certain places pay to officers and family separation pay to military couples without dependents; recognize the contribution of foreign language experts in the Persian Gulf with proficiency pay despite not being certified because of the rush to put them in the theater; remove the prohibition against payment of imminent danger and family separation pay when war or national emergency is declared; authorize a penalty free delay to the income tax filing deadline for those serving in the theater; extend the savings program investment limit for POW's and MIA's; and remove the limitation on selling back leave for survivors of members who die on active duty.

The activation of Reserve and retired forces has highlighted the need for a number of initiatives to facilitate the transition of the reservists and retirees from civilian life to the military, and hopefully back to their homes and families in the near future. The bill would:

Extend the unexpired period allowed for reinvestment of profits from the sale of a home; recognize that unmarried reservists maintain residences by authorizing payment of housing allowance; preserve the entitlement to 6-month grace period for reservists repaying Government student loans; and authorize the recall of retired officers in the highest grade held on active duty.

Finally the bill includes a sense of Congress that the German Government be approached to provide medical care for military dependents in Germany in order to replace the military medical resources dispatched to the Persian Gulf to treat Desert Storm casualties.

I encourage my colleagues to act quickly on this legislation to protect the interests and welfare of the troops in the field and their families at home. As I stated at the outset, this is another step in an continuing effort. We will continue to examine personnel and pay systems closely to ensure that they provide the financial security that we intended. Given the level of financial sacrifice endured by many reservists, I am confident that the Congress will want to provide some assistance to offset the cost of patriotism, and protect the viability of Reserve recruiting in the future. Now that the Nation has committed our forces to combat, I believe the Servicemen's Group Life Insurance should be re-evaluated to ensure that it is providing the right level of protection. I will be working with the gentleman from Mississippi, the ranking majority member on my subcommittee and the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to examine the need for a change in the benefit level.

We speak of our high-technology arsenal achieving a high success rate, but let us not forget that there is a professional, patriotic man or woman operating these machines. It is a tribute to the dedication of these men and women, and something for which all Americans should be proud.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

□ 1430

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, we had a high level debate just a few days ago before a very historic vote authorizing President Bush to stop Saddam Hussein. I thought that that vote and that debate elevated this body.

Let me offer another opinion on the vote that we are having today. I think that the Democrat leadership made a mistake in bringing us back for a cover vote. I do not think we need a cover vote. I think Members who voted one way the other day can explain that to their constituents in town hall meetings and in press releases and interviews. I think that Members who in good conscience voted against it should

not have any reason to change their position at this time, and those Members who voted for it have all of the same justifications before them that they had just a couple of days ago.

One point on a substantive issue that I think has been brought out by the attack on Israel yesterday. It is very clear now that we live in an age of missiles, and we are going to have to be able to stop missiles if we are going to secure our safety and that of our allies. The impact of the Scuds in Tel Aviv drove that point home. This Congress should leave politics behind in this year and we should dedicate ourselves to advancing the President's strategic defense initiative. Clearly the lives of Americans and our allies hang in the balance and hang on that decision.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, much of the national debate over U.S. policy in the Persian Gulf these past 5 months was couched, almost instinctively, in the classic moral categories and language of the just-war tradition. That is not a sign of weakness. It is, rather, a sign of strength, of resolve, and of the good will of the American people.

Now that we have engaged the forces of Iraqi aggression in the gulf, I would like to share with my colleagues a brief reflection on how United States action has satisfied the classic moral criteria of the just war tradition.

Is ours a just cause? A just cause has existed since August 2, 1990, when Iraq, in violation of the most fundamental norms of international law and civilized political behavior, militarily invaded Kuwait and declared it to be an integral part of Iraq. Resistance, including armed resistance, to Iraqi aggression is indeed a just cause, for it is armed resistance in defense of the basic moral and legal norms that proscribe such aggression.

Have we conducted ourselves with a right intention? We have no aggressive aims against the people of Iraq. As the President has insisted time and again, our quarrel is with the regime of Saddam Hussein. Moreover, we are acting in order to deter future aggression, to restore a minimum of order to the conduct of international affairs, and to create the conditions under which a stable peace might be built in the region.

Has the war in which we are engaged been authorized by a competent authority? Certainly. In domestic terms, our use of armed force has been sanctioned by the democratically elected President and Congress of the United States. Internationally, it has been sanctioned by the Security Council of the United Nations.

As to the criterion of proportionality—will the good to be achieved by the use of armed force clearly outweigh the evil that would result from leaving Iraqi aggression to stand—we should not forget that Iraq has already perpetrated a great evil, and has promised to do more. Iraq has systematically brutalized the people of Kuwait. It has flagrantly attacked the

people of Israel. Condoning Iraq's aggression against Kuwait would have opened the door to further evil by an ambitious and aggressive dictator, Saddam Hussein.

Do we have a reasonable hope of success? This was always a judgment call, on which men of honor could disagree. But responsible political and military leaders, with access to the best available intelligence information, and with an intimate knowledge of the military and political capabilities of the coalition we had gathered, told the Congress and the President that we could indeed succeed.

Finally, the just war tradition asks us to treat military action as a last resort. That is precisely what we have done. Every effort to negotiate an unconditional Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait failed, over a period of 5½ months. Sanctions, while effective in some respect, were sure to burden the civilian population of Iraq—those whom the just war tradition would urge us to consider as noncombatants—far more heavily than the country's military-political elite. Last resort in the just war tradition is not an arithmetic concept; one could always imagine just one more thing that could be tried. No, last resort asks us to judge that reasonable men would conclude that all reasonable efforts at a peaceful resolution of the war initiated by Iraq on August 2, 1990, had been made, and had failed. We could, and did, make that judgment in good conscience.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think we can be confident that United States military action against Iraqi aggression satisfies the conditions under which the classic moral tradition of the West would sanction the resort to armed force.

As for our adherence to the moral laws of conduct within war as outlined by the just war tradition, I should like to emphasize for my colleagues the stress that has been put on our intention to avoid striking civilian targets in Iraq. Indeed, our forces are operating in such a disciplined manner, and under such strict rules of target recognition, that a number of pilots returned to base with their weapons unexpended, rather than risk an attack that might result in serious civilian casualties—and this, after spending at least an hour flying through hostile air space. I think it says something important about the United States and its Armed Forces, Mr. Speaker, that in confronting a barbarian we are holding ourselves accountable to civilized norms of military conduct. And I should like to commend the President, Secretary Cheney, General Powell, and the other leaders of our Armed Forces for their commitment to the just war tradition.

The just war tradition—a tradition which seeks to link the use of proportionate and discriminate armed force to the pursuit of peace, security, freedom, justice, and order—is alive and thriving in the United States of America, Mr. Speaker. Charges, from whatever quarter, that we are acting hastily and immorally are either willfully ignorant or morally obtuse.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HUTTO].

Mr. HUTTO. Mr. Speaker, we all feel many emotions concerning the events of the last 2 days. My immediate emotions are pride and caution. How wonderful it is to be a citizen of this, the

greatest nation on Earth. I'm proud of the courageous men and women who are willingly placing themselves in harm's way to defend and preserve the freedoms we all cherish. I'm proud of our President and his decisions concerning the Persian Gulf, and I'm proud of this congress which debated the United States' policy in the gulf, and voted to uphold the United Nations' resolution demanding Iraq's unconditional withdrawal from Kuwait.

I'm very proud in two other specific areas, Mr. Speaker. I am proud of the continued determination of the Congress and the American people, who over the last decade, supported funding for our defense preparedness. The Readiness Subcommittee, which I chair, has consistently supported the necessary funds for the well-trained and well-equipped operation we are now witnessing. I'm also proud of the contribution of my constituents in northwest Florida. The people of Florida's First District are directly involved in defense activities including training of naval pilots, developing and testing many of the weapons being used in this deployment, and researching and developing numerous activities in both the Navy and the Air Force. My district hosts an Air Force Tactical Fighter Wing, the Air Force's Special Operations Command, many special operations personnel, and a wide array of naval activities. I salute the tremendous contribution of these fine men and women.

Caution, however, is in order. Let us not forget that Saddam Hussein is a ruthless tyrant, as was so horribly witnessed last night when Scud missiles fell on Israel. Clearly, the intended effect of this attack on civilians was to strike fear and terror and to divide the coalition of U.S. allies.

Not only will the United States and our allies achieve the U.N. goal of liberating Kuwait, but, when it's over, hopefully we will have done the world a great favor by eliminating Saddam Hussein's future ability to wage nuclear, chemical, and biological warfare. Thank God, this future threat will not haunt mankind.

War is never easy. We must remain supportive of our Commander in Chief and united with our allies in our effort to oust this dictator from Kuwait. The pride of success must always be tempered with the resolve to deal with the aftermath of our actions and to ensure that war is always our last resort. My respect, prayers, and support not only go out to the brave airmen, soldiers, sailors, and marines, but to their family, friends, and neighbors as well.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS].

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in firm support of our President and our courageous service personnel today in conflict in the Persian Gulf region.

None of us wanted this conflict—no one here on Capitol Hill or in the White House, and certainly no one serving this Nation on the front lines in Saudi Arabia.

Everything was done within the bounds of reason and principle to persuade Saddam Hussein to leave Kuwait in peace, and we should be clear that no one outside of Iraq broke the peace. This must be placed squarely at the feet of Saddam Hussein, who covetously, brazenly, and without warning attacked his neighbor.

While my thoughts and prayers are first and foremost for the safety of our brave soldiers, sailors, and aviators in the gulf region, I remain convinced that Saddam was bent on escalating the armed conflict even beyond his invasion of Kuwait, and that any course short of abandoning our national interests, goals, friends, and allies in the region would have brought us to the present state of affairs regardless.

Furthermore, while we all would have preferred that sanctions had been more successful, I don't believe this would have moved Saddam to change his dark plans—and with this in mind, each day of delay meant only more misery, abuse, torture, and pillage for the people of Kuwait.

Now, Saddam has turned on another neighbor, Israel, a noncombatant nation not involved in Operation Desert Storm. Furthermore, this was an unprovoked terror attack, not a military strike, but targeted at unarmed civilians. This is further proof—if we needed it—that none of Saddam's neighbors are safe.

Stopping Saddam sooner rather than later will save lives in the long run and make the world a safer place to live for all of us. That is why our service personnel are in Saudi Arabia today.

I have nothing but tremendous pride, admiration, and deep gratitude for the men and women of our Armed Forces who, in the words of the resolution before us today, "are carrying out their missions with professional excellence, dedicated patriotism and exemplary bravery."

It cannot be better said, Mr. Speaker, and I wholeheartedly support its passage. Surely we can do no less.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON].

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, let me express my complete and unwavering backing for this resolution that expresses our support for the President as Commander in Chief and for the American forces engaged in combat against Iraq.

We should know that the liberation of Kuwait and the effort to reduce the threat of further Iraqi aggression in the region will not be done in a few days. There will be surprises and there will be setbacks, as we say with the Iraqi success in launching a handful of

Scud missiles against Israel last night. Hard fighting remains, Mr. Speaker.

And yet, we can take comfort in the courage, professionalism, and dedication, of all those involved in this grand undertaking. The planners have done their job well. America has been very fortunate in the quality of the individuals who are proud to call themselves soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines. They really are the finest this Nation has to offer. They have been trained well and provided the best equipment with which to do the job and we are seeing the results. When the military history of this century is written, the American effort in this conflict will be the premier example of planning and execution.

Our prayers, our hopes, and our thoughts are with them for the successful and safe completion of their mission. We want the young Americans in uniform to know of the overwhelming support from home that this resolution represents. God bless them and God bless America.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA].

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 2. This resolution symbolizes as strongly as ever the unity and support of the U.S. House of Representatives, the People's House, to our courageous men and women serving our country in Operation Desert Storm. Many of them are my constituents from Montgomery County, MD. I even have a former staffer who is serving there, and many friends.

We in the House of Representatives representing the people are very proud of them, and we are very grateful to them for their professionalism and for their valor.

The resolution also shows, and I heartily agree, the unity and support of the United States House of Representatives to our President, our Commander in Chief, who has shown valor, and calm resolute leadership in the Persian Gulf hostilities.

We are appalled that Saddam Hussein has resorted to the heinous act of desperation last evening in attacking civilian targets in Israel, our ally that has no part in this conflict. Israel has been heroic in its resistance.

Let there be no doubt that our country unites behind our troops, behind our Commander in Chief, and God bless them and God bless America.

□ 1440

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAZZOLI].

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, let me first rise in very strong support of the resolution.

Let me commend the leadership of my friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], our majority

leader, both today and last Saturday. We are here today by reason of his leadership.

Whatever our views last Saturday, we have but one view today, and that view is to support our fighting troops in the gulf, to support their families, to support their commanders and to support our Commander in Chief, the President.

In that sense, I pledge to do everything possible so that we have "no more Vietnams" in the sense that our troops need to have our support for an application of total force to win that battle in the Persian Gulf. They need our support by way of equipment and resources of all kinds. They need our moral support, and that is really what this resolution suggests: that they enjoy the undivided support of this Congress and of this Nation as they go about their task to complete their mission, to complete it quickly, to complete it successfully, and to complete it with as little bloodshed as possible.

They have our prayers and, Mr. Speaker, they have our support.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], who serves with such distinction on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and on the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution, the U.S. military forces—including a large number of my constituents—currently engaged in battle in the Persian Gulf, and support and appreciation for the leadership actions of our Commander in Chief, President George Bush.

Wednesday night, as news of the initial U.S. and allied retaliatory strikes filtered through to the West, this Member wondered what more our President could have done to resolve this crisis peacefully.

We organized the most comprehensive sanctions policy the world had ever known—and yet it had become clear the sanctions were not working. The embargo was leaking critical materials and technology, and the Director of the CIA had indicated that Saddam Hussein could hold out indefinitely because of the deprivation which he would be quite willing to inflict upon the Iraqi people.

All reasonable avenues of diplomacy were tried. Over and over the United States, the United Nations, the Arab League, the European Community, and others sought to achieve a peaceful solution—only to have their efforts summarily rebuffed.

Up to—and beyond—the January 15 deadline, diplomatic efforts were made to get Iraq to leave Kuwait. But Saddam Hussein never gave peace a chance. Surely we will all mourn the human suffering, but just as certainly the responsibility for that suffering rests with Saddam Hussein.

With no adequate and effective option remaining but the use of force, the United States and allied forces have responded magnificently. The esprit de corps, the idealism, and especially the extraordinary professionalism exhibited at all levels has been exemplary. They are courageous men and women who have been assigned a hazardous mission, and their response is in the very best traditions of the U.S. Armed Forces. The contributions, sacrifices, and support of their families should also be recognized and this Member extends this tribute to them.

This body should also recognize the very major contribution of our allies. We have been informed that a very significant share of the air strikes against Iraq have been carried out by the Saudi and the Free Kuwaiti Air Forces. The British, the French, Canadians, and the Italians have also directly participated in the ordeal air strikes in important ways. This is a allied war effort, Mr. Speaker, and these allies rightly deserve praise.

Mr. Speaker, while this resolution rightly extends its unequivocal support for our men and women now engaged in combat in the Persian Gulf, this Member would have preferred to see a much stronger endorsement of our President. He is our leader, he is our Commander in Chief. And he rightly deserves commendation for making the very wrenching, difficult decisions of war and peace. Therefore, this Member would say—"Well done, Mr. President."

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. McDERMOTT].

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of our troops in the gulf.

Earlier this week, 30,000 people marched through my district to voice their hope for peace. I regret that their message was not heeded. I regret that a new generation of Americans must discover first hand the costs and consequences of war. And I regret that the new world order seems to have begun with a new world army.

I remain adamantly opposed to the policies that propelled us into this war. But one of the lessons I learned from Vietnam is that we must not let our opposition to policy weaken support for our people—for the individual men and women who have been asked to fight for us. These men and women are under enormous strain, facing constant danger. They volunteered to put their lives on the line, and no matter how strongly we may disagree with the policy that put them there, we must give them our unequivocal support. They are doing an outstanding job so far, and I join my colleagues in offering our gratitude and admiration for their work. This is not a vote to endorse our policy, but to support our troops.

I hope their mission soon will be finished and that their commitment will inspire us to do our own jobs better. Our troops are fighting this war because we had neither the vision nor the wisdom to prevent it. We can only hope

now that they will be brought home as quickly and safely as possible.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIPINSKI].

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, which expresses support for our men and women serving our nation in the Persian Gulf region. As one Member of Congress who supported a continuation of diplomacy and economic sanctions against Iraq, I can say unequivocally, today I stand in full support of our Commander in Chief, President Bush, and the men and women of our Armed Forces who are engaged in battle.

In the turbulent waters of the Persian Gulf, the hostile skies of Iraq and the threatening sands near the Kuwaiti border, our men and women are fully engaged in hostilities with Iraq. This is not the time for divisive political commentary whether the President's decision to liberate Kuwait is the right policy—because this is no longer President Bush's policy, it is America's policy as our troops are in battle. I know and understand there will be Americans who will voice opposition to our actions in the Persian Gulf. This is to be expected in a democratic nation which permits the wonderful freedoms of free speech and political dissent.

Our young men and women in the military have been ordered to carry out their mission, and preliminary reports indicate they are performing with professionalism, bravery, and care to avoid American and allied casualties. We must avoid the temptation to become overly optimistic about the difficult struggle we are involved in. The effort underway to drive Saddam Hussein from Kuwait and eliminate his nuclear, chemical, and biological threat will be successful. However, the military battle plan should pursue a course that brings us a swift and decisive victory over Iraq with the lowest level of American, allied, and civilian casualties. My thoughts and prayers lie with the men and women serving our Nation proudly and their loved ones here at home, in this time of great concern.

After the last bullets, bombs, and missiles have been unleashed, there will be ample opportunity for our Nation to review and reflect upon the political decisions which have been made which brought our Nation into hostilities with Iraq. On another day, we can use this thorough policy review to hopefully avoid similar battles in the future. But for today, we must stand in full support of our brave men and women who face hostilities in a faraway land.

I ask my colleagues to join my constituents and me in strong support of our Armed Forces in the Persian Gulf and indicate that support by casting a vote in favor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 2.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I commend the gentleman for putting this on the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, I think everybody agrees that this is an important and legitimate resolution for us to debate

and to pass. Let me just say, because I believe we are all going to vote yes, let me just say, quite honestly, that we do thank the men and women of our Armed Forces for the work that they do when they join, and this is an All Volunteer Force, when they operate in the ranks here in the United States and overseas, and many of them have operated in the NATO theater for many years, and when they now are forced to go to war, they have acquitted themselves to this date magnificently. They are a constant source of pride to us whether engaged in warfare or not. Hopefully not.

But now they are engaged in the ultimate sacrifice for their country, putting themselves in the front lines. We thank them. We honor them. We hope that we can pay them enough respect and homage that they will understand from our words and by our deeds that we support them 100 percent, and when they come home, they will be recognized as having made a great contribution to the cause of freedom and justice in the country and in the world.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LAGOMARSINO].

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution, President Bush's leadership, that of Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney, Secretary of State Jim Baker, Chairman Colin Powell, our brave men and women deployed in the gulf carrying out their missions in Operation Desert Storm, and their brave and patriotic families.

While we are still in the early stages of operations which could run for some period of time, I am encouraged by the reported successes thus far and am cautiously optimistic overall. Clearly, our success is due to the professional excellence, realistic training, patriotism, and exemplary bravery of our GI's. I continue to pray for the safety of our forces and for a quick victory with minimal casualties to them as well as Iraqi and Kuwaiti civilians.

Today's resolution, which unanimously passed the Senate yesterday, is important because it sends a very clear and strong signal that the Congress, the elected Representatives of the American people, support Operation Desert Storm. Saddam Hussein, a dictator who has no concept or understanding of a real democracy and how it functions, may have taken comfort with our recent, lengthy debate on Persian Gulf policy options. He may have thought we were divided. We are not. This resolution and the very broad support it enjoys underscores American unity behind Operation Desert Storm.

Like all Americans, I do not want war. But, without question, the responsibility for hostilities lies solely with Saddam Hussein. He has the ability to stop it if he wants to. Unfortunately, Iraq's attack with Scud missiles

against Israel, a noncombatant, last night appears to be an attempt to expand the war. Knowing he cannot win the military conflict he began, Saddam Hussein through attacking Israel is trying to turn this into a political and ideological conflict. Thanks to Israel's restraint, despite enormous pressure to retaliate, Saddam's efforts have not been fully successful. But, this attack only reemphasizes that none of Iraq's neighbors—especially civilian population centers which Saddam targets with Scuds—are safe from Saddam Hussein's aggression.

Last night's Scud attacks also confirm the wisdom of President Bush's order to use force sooner rather than later. Iraq has chemical weapons and has been trying to develop nuclear ones. However, I do not believe that Iraq has been able at this time to marry its chemical bombs to the Scud ballistic missile, despite an accelerated program to do so. If Iraq had been able to chemically arm the Scuds, I believe it would have done so in its attack against Israel. Imagine the horror of such an attack and the further escalation of war in the Middle East it would have created. Saddam Hussein, through gas warfare, would be continuing Hitler's genocide. And, it goes beyond saying, what the consequences would be if that dictator had atomic warheads for his missiles.

It is also apparent that American high-technology weapons systems have helped make the difference and, thus far, kept American and civilian casualties low, thanks in part to their pinpoint accuracy. These systems, like the extremely successful Tomahawk cruise missile, are the products of the Reagan-Bush defense program I supported. I recall some in Congress and the public unjustly criticizing this responsible defense program. Clearly, they were wrong and I am glad, and I can guarantee that our forces in the Gulf are glad, that we did not listen to them.

For example, our forces were able to destroy an incoming Scud missile in midair by using the Patriot air defense missile. The Patriot's antiballistic missile capability proves the validity of the SDI and the success of the SDI technological developments.

The realistic training our ground and air forces received at Fort Irwin in California's Mojave Desert and at Nellis Air Base in the Nevada Desert, respectively, has helped make a difference that is paying off today in American lives saved and objectives achieved.

Operation Desert Storm is not the United States against Iraq. Rather, it is the world against Saddam Hussein and his aggression. With the consent of our allies, President Bush reluctantly ordered force be used only after exhausting every reasonable diplomatic effort and after recognizing that sanc-

tions alone would not force Iraq to withdraw or cease threatening our national security interests in the region. We tried all reasonable peaceful approaches, only to be repeatedly rejected by Saddam Hussein.

Our actions are fully consistent with U.N. Security Council Resolution 678 and the authority this Congress granted to President Bush on January 12. Over 28 nations have military forces in the Gulf allied against Saddam Hussein. Already, in addition to our contribution, initial air operations have included forces from Britain, France, Saudi Arabia, free Kuwait, Italy, and Canada. Like all our international partners helping free Kuwait and restore security and stability to the Persian Gulf, I hope all our objectives can be achieved expeditiously and with the least possible casualties.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ORTIZ].

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strongest support of our troops in the Persian Gulf and this resolution commending the leadership of our President as Commander in Chief of our forces.

The time has now come to publicly and vocally restate our commitment to supporting our troops, their families, and our President during this critical time in our Nation's history.

Over the past few weeks we have had a great deal of public debate in this country over the best means of achieving and maintaining peace in the Middle East.

The points of disagreement have always been over the means and not the ends.

The debate has never been over the support of our troops.

I believe that every person in this Congress, as well as the American people are united, and have always been united in support of the troops stationed in the Persian Gulf region and their loved ones left behind.

We are a country in a community of nations who cannot be happy about war.

And yet, the world community has spoken unanimously in its condemnation of the invasion of Kuwait by Iraq.

The world has agreed that Iraq must withdraw from Kuwait completely and unconditionally.

Now that hostilities have begun, we must unite in support of our troops.

Now is the time to cease the debate. The path has been chosen.

As I visited the troops stationed in Saudi Arabia just a few months ago, I was deeply impressed by the impact of United States public opinion on the morale of the troops.

Many of those stationed on the front lines, ready to defend our Nation's interests, expressed concern to me over the continued criticism of the President during this crisis.

This criticism does have a negative impact on troop morale and must stop. Our troops need to know in a tangible way the deep level of undivided support they have from people all across this great Nation.

I ask my constituents, my colleagues, and all of the American people to pray for peace, protection of our troops, comfort for their families, and guidance for our President. We hope and pray for a short war with few casualties.

May God grant us wisdom during these troubling days.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH].

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, Saddam Hussein has miscalculated on at least four scores: he underestimated the capacities of U.S. Armed Forces; he underestimated the resolve of the President; he underestimated the character and backbone of the American people; and, perhaps most importantly, he underestimated the commitment of the international community to the rule of law.

What I would like to emphasize at this time is not the first of their miscalculations, which have become so self-evident in the events of the past 48 hours, but the last—our obligations under international law.

It is incumbent on the world community to inform Saddam that at the end of this conflict he and his henchmen can be expected to confront a Nuremberg-like tribunal for crimes against humanity. After all, he has used poison gas in violation of both the Geneva Convention of 1925 and the Biological Weapons Convention of 1972, committed aggression in violation of the U.N. Charter, and violated an assortment of conventions on terrorism, human rights, and the treatment of diplomats.

Now, with the indiscriminate missile attack on innocents in Israel, this anti-prophet must also be held accountable before the bar of all religious ethics.

Unholy men cannot lead holy wars. No religion on the face of the Earth condones the senseless slaughter of innocents.

□ 1450

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAYDOS].

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I, as a matter of record, did vote against the President, against Desert Shield. I do not think it is inconsistent at this time to rise and state my position. At that time I had sincere thoughts that the action was premature, that we should have done more. That is past.

Now the current events to me dictate the time for criticism has passed as well, now. In my mind, criticism serves no purpose at this time. It is now a time for this Nation to come together,

behind the President, to support Desert Storm, and to work for the swift completion of this military action. Most importantly, we must stand together as a Nation at this time to support our troops in the Persian Gulf. These American men and women deserve our backing. They have been sent to a very hostile land to perform a very dangerous and a very necessary job at this time. They and their families back home, their parents, sisters, brothers and relatives need the understanding of all Americans, particularly all Members of this Congress. Remember, about 1 family of every 230 families in this country is being touched by this war. It would be unfair to them, basically and fundamentally unfair. The decision has been made, to be less than 100 percent behind this effort, their efforts, and the President's efforts.

Again, I state that I do not feel that I am inconsistent in a vote that I passed a few days ago in this position that I express upon the RECORD today.

If I may speak on behalf of my colleagues in the House, I say that we can only, outside of working and being resolved, we can only pray at this time that this conflict is resolved soon, and that Iraq will understand that though America may be slow to pick up its arms, once it does and enters a fray, it is there to win.

Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, as we all know, President Bush, with the support and concurrence of other members of the United Nations coalition opposed to Iraq's unprovoked and illegal invasion of Kuwait, launched Operation Desert Storm to enforce the United Nations' imposed deadline for Iraq's withdrawal from Kuwait.

So far, the news is encouraging. American and coalition forces, including the British, French, and Saudis, have inflicted significant damage on Iraq's military capabilities. I can only pray that our intervention will continue with little loss of American lives.

Still, Mr. Speaker, last week, when the House debated the resolution to give President Bush the authority to begin offensive action by American troops, I voted for peace. I have seen the ravages of war first-hand in the Pacific in World War II and I had hoped never to see another war. Further, I had and still have no desire to see American men and women die in any war far from home.

But the time for debate is over. Both the House and Senate have given the President the authority to commit our forces to military action in the Persian Gulf, and the President has sent them to battle.

Current events dictate the time for criticism has passed as well. Criticism serves no purpose at this point in time. It is now time for this nation to come together behind the President, to support Operation Desert Storm, and to

work for the swift completion of this military action.

Most importantly, we must stand together as a nation to support our troops in the Persian Gulf. These American men and women deserve our backing. They have been sent to a hostile land to perform a dangerous and, now necessary, job. They and their families back home—parents, children, sisters, and brothers—need the understanding of all Americans. Remember, about 1 family out of every 230 families in this country is being touched by this war in the Persian Gulf. It would be unfair to them, now that the decision has been made, to be less than 100 percent behind their effort.

We can only pray that this conflict will be resolved soon, and that Iraq will understand that though America may be slow to pick up its arms, once it does enter the fray, it is there to win.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. We all hoped this war would never come. But on January 16 we crossed a bridge of no return.

This could not be more evident than it was last night, when Iraq launched nine Scud missiles on the innocent civilian population of Israel—a country which had not attacked Iraq and had even promised not to do so.

The American men and women in Operation Desert Storm are brave and well-trained; their equipment, as we've seen in the performance of our Air Force and Patriot Anti-Missile System, is the finest in the world—and by all accounts they are performing their mission superbly. We can all be truly proud of them, and I am confident they will prevail.

We face a war which may not be short and will certainly not be painless.

The consequences of failure, for the Middle East and for the entire world, would be devastating, and both our troops and their Commander in Chief must have the country's support in the effort.

This resolution, although symbolic, is an important part of the effort to show the country's support for its men and women in combat, and I hope everyone here will support it.

As Abraham Lincoln said long ago:

With malice toward none, with charity toward all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in.

And after we have done so, let us again work to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.

None of us can match those words, but their sentiment is as appropriate today as it was on the 4th of March,

1865. I would simply like to add a prayer.

Lord, please bless our young men and women with the support of their families, their friends and their united nations; and bring them back to us safely, with pride and with success.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, this morning at his press conference, the President said that we must keep two things in mind: First, that this effort will take some time; and second, that we must be realistic, that there will be losses. War is never cheap nor easy.

Mr. Speaker, as one who has been opposed to and continues to be opposed to the use of force in the Persian Gulf, I urge those who share my view to keep two things in mind. One is that we must continue to express our disagreement with this policy, but we must do so in a peaceful way. Those Members who are against the use of force have a special responsibility to express our disagreement in a peaceful and non-violent way. Second, that there should be no doubt that although we have strong disagreement with the policy here, that there is no disagreement in our support and prayers for the troops and their families, that we support their courage, and we are grateful to those who put forth this resolution today to give Members this opportunity to demonstrate that support for those brave young people in the Persian Gulf.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, January 12, 1991, this House voted to give President Bush authority to use military force to bring about a withdrawal of Iraqi military forces from Kuwait by the January 15 deadline imposed by U.N. resolutions.

The debate lasted for 24 hours and was characterized by sincere differences of opinion on the part of the Members of this body. The opponents of that resolution thought that more time should be given for diplomatic efforts and to give U.N. imposed sanctions additional time to work.

Indeed, further diplomatic overtures were attempted, after the vote, by the Secretary General of the United Nations and others. These attempts were arrogantly rebuffed by Saddam Hussein.

Every day that the time of reckoning was put off brought about more raping, murdering, and pillaging of a small nation.

While we waited and hoped and prayed, Iraq used the additional time to strengthen their defenses; thereby causing many more casualties amongst our forces.

On January 16, 1991, the effort to liberate Kuwait began when allied air

forces attacked military targets in Iraq and Kuwait. Now that the battle has been joined, it is critical that this body close ranks in support of our President and the men and women of our Armed Forces. It is in the best interests of all of our men and women, their families, and the American people that we use massive force to bring this conflict to a successful conclusion with a minimum of casualties.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in unequivocal support of our President and of our brave men and women in the U.S. Armed Forces.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be an American, but I have never been as proud as I have during the past 48 hours; fighting men and women, American men and women of our Armed Forces in Saudi Arabia and the Middle East have all made Americans proud. I stand wholeheartedly behind this resolution in saying that we support them. We support the work that they are doing, which is in the cause of freedom for all Americans. We support the President in these difficult hours.

My heart reaches out in support to the brave people of Israel who unprovoked have had bombs come down in the midst of the population.

I think, Mr. Speaker, this just goes to show what a thug Saddam Hussein is.

□ 1500

It goes to show what a threat he is not only to the nations of the Middle East, but to all of us around the world.

We stand with the people of Israel in this time of need. We stand with the brave people of Kuwait and Saudi Arabia and all the people in the Middle East in fighting aggression.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM].

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, there is no question today that most all of us, I assume all of us, are going to vote for this resolution and vote for it with great pride for our military and the accomplishments we have had in the last couple days, vote for it knowing the importance of sending a continued message to Saddam Hussein that indeed we are united, we are intent upon a victory, sooner rather than later in this war, and that indeed it will occur.

I am, however, compelled to make a couple of thoughts and comments to my colleagues as we make this vote. One of them is that, yes, we are proud of what has happened in that last couple days. The high technology is superb. It is obvious that our defense preparedness has been justified in the expenditures that we have spent for this purpose over the last few years, are now being revealed for all to see as the most superior military equipment in

the world, as well, of course, the part that we are most pleased about, the men and the women serving in our Armed Forces are executing their game plan and using this weaponry with great skill.

But the second thing that I think is important is to reflect on the fact that this vote today is not the key vote. The vote that we had last week authorizing it was the role of this Congress in making its decision to support the President and the U.N. resolution and to begin this process of saying, OK, time is up, Saddam Hussein, we are not putting up with this anymore.

At this point in time it is the responsibility of the Congress, it seems to me, to simply sit back, observe what is happening, support the Commander in Chief, support our military who are making these decisions, and not get involved further in the process, except to help those families of those who may have casualties and those who may otherwise be affected by this war process.

That does not mean we should not be aware, that we should not be observing, but now is not the time for Congress to be involved in this war. Now is the time to let our Commander in Chief and our military experts be involved. Let them do their job. They are doing it well. We are proud of what they are doing.

We pray that the war is short. We pray that casualties continue to be low and we pray that Saddam Hussein comes to some rational sense in the shorter term, rather than the longer, and ends this process and gets out of Kuwait.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH].

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, in my district in central New York State, the news of the coalition attack against Saddam Hussein's military machine brought a strange mix of emotion I'm sure my colleagues will identify with: Excitement, relief, sadness, fear.

After months of talk, threats, diplomatic efforts, rising hopes, and desperate pleas—the passed deadline and the start of war seemed unreal.

Reaching us as they did around dinner time, the news reports were especially poignant for families with children who have many, many questions about such a terrifying ordeal. As we followed those news reports, we were encouraged by the successes—including, I am proud to add, those of the 174th Tactical Fighter Wing of the Air National Guard, the Boys from Syracuse.

"This is too good to be true," we said the next morning. And it was. The forces of good versus evil were never more clearly defined than when Saddam Hussein, in apparent desperation and with the cowardice of the cornered and exposed villain, struck out at Israel, the second state in the region to be attacked unprovoked by this menace to the world. It should not be lost on us or the world that

Saddam's targets were neighborhoods while the targets of the United States and its coalition partners are strictly military-related sites.

Thanks in part to our forces, Kuwait will be free again. And I know no one in this Chamber who doubts that Israel will also remain free, intact, and with our total support.

As these events unfold, the people of central New York reacted in several ways.

Some people have marched to demonstrate against our involvement. Others have confronted these demonstrators with words of defense for our Government's course of action. Clearly, some are against force and others are in favor. But, Mr. Speaker, I believe all central New Yorkers and all Americans are unified on one point. Though we may hold separate judgments and believe in different means in attaining an end, we support—unflinchingly, unequivocally, and unendingly—our women and men in uniform who are fighting in the Persian Gulf region.

I believe the majority of Americans know this is the only course to a lasting peace. We know our forces are fighting for nothing less important nor less grand than freedom itself.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has been a model for the world during the tumultuous rush to democracy by formerly closed societies. Now we must continue to show the world the way our system works. I believe this resolution addresses an important part of the model: In time of war, let no nation or individual doubt the existence of our ultimate unity.

Last night in central New York a group of high school students took to the streets. Instead of throwing blood on the Federal building or burning draft cards or shouting obscenities into microphones, they did something quite amazing and moving—and I thought, inspirational. They did what we are trying to do today.

They marched, and while they marched they sang our national anthem. And their purpose, as one student stated when a reporter asked, was—"Not to say one way or the other whether we agree with the use of force. That is already happening. We are here to show our support for our troops."

I hope we will follow the lead of the Americans like those students and show the unanimous pride and confidence—and concern—that exists in this Chamber and in this Nation for our compatriots who are at this moment facing an ominous threat to freedom. To show that we are all, with them, proud to be Americans.

I wish them—and all central New Yorkers wish them—safety, success, and an early return.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS].

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise with pain in my heart, tears in my eyes, and with profound support for the safety of the young men and women in the Persian Gulf; however, if it was wrong to go to war against Iraq before hostilities began, it is wrong now that war has begun.

The commission of an immoral act does not remedy its morality.

I share with you the desire to support the Americans engaged in this conflict.

I cannot sleep at night thinking of all the young men and women in the gulf and their families. My own nephew is there. Thirty percent of the Armed Forces are African-Americans. Forty-eight percent of the women in the gulf are African-Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I can think of no better way to support them than by bringing this war to an end. I did not support the President when he threatened to commit this great wrong. I can think of no reason to support him now that he has done it.

Let me warn my colleagues that for the sake of restoring the Emir of Kuwait to his throne, a cause totally unrelated to any American interest, we may have begun a long and bloody conflict that all of us will have cause to regret.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RIDGE].

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, just 1 week ago, we exercised our rights as a free and democratic people to debate and to resolve the question of a military response to Saddam Hussein's brutal annexation of Kuwait. At the conclusion of the debate, we authorized the President, our Commander in Chief to use our armed services in support of the U.N.'s action against Iraq.

From the outset the President has pledged this would not be another Vietnam. From this reassuring words on Wednesday evening to the impressive performance of the collective military in the past 36 hours, it is clear that the administration has kept its commitment. Today we have the opportunity—and I might add responsibility—to make a symbolic, but equally significant commitment.

Today we meet, not to express differences over policy, but to declare our unity as a nation and our unwavering support as individuals for the men and women of Operation Desert Storm and their families.

The chilling echoes of the antiwar movement still ring in the ears of many Vietnam veterans. Many have carried in their hearts and minds the belief that the lack of popular support and potential resolve did more damage to their effort than the best soldiers or equipment their enemy could bring to bear.

Regardless of personal feelings about the use of the military in the gulf, we must be united in vocal and visible support for our fellow Americans serving there.

It has been fundamental to the American experience that each generation builds on the successes and sacrifices of earlier generations. And there is no greater sacrifice that one American can make for his or her country than fighting and possibly dying to promote its ideals and defend its interest.

As a Nation we can have neither doubt nor dissent over our confidence

in their personal commitment, abilities and resolve or our eternal gratitude for their enormous sacrifice.

We unite today in hope and in prayer that the hostilities will end soon and our service men and women will return home safely to a grateful Nation.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY].

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS].

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this is another of the most difficult resolutions to have come before the House of Representatives in many years. Certainly, the most difficult I have ever cast was the one last Saturday when the House voted to give the President a blank check to go to war. I did not vote with the majority because I am opposed to war generally, and specifically in the Persian Gulf because I did not, and still do not, believe that all our alternatives—economic, diplomatic, and judicial—were exhausted.

It is my belief that when nations go to war it should be because they have exhausted their intellectual capabilities to reach a satisfactory solution of the problem, whatever it may be. As the Academic American Encyclopedia puts it, "In most modern societies, the resort to war usually occurs only when other methods of resolving differences have been exhausted. The generally preferred means of resolving differences among modern nations is through discussion, negotiation, and compromise—the tools of diplomacy." Looking at the gulf situation, I cannot recall a single instance of discussion between President Bush and Iraqi leader Hussein, nor any action resembling compromise by either party.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 2 states that the Senate—the House of Representatives concurring—resolve "That (a) the Congress commends and supports the efforts and leadership of the President as Commander in Chief in the Persian Gulf hostilities."

Mr. Speaker, I cannot in good conscience commend the President for taking this action at a time when all alternatives had not at least been attempted. To do so would not be in keeping with my action last week and would compromise those principles.

The second part of the resolution states that, "(b) The Congress unequivocally supports the men and women of our Armed Forces who are carrying out their missions with professional excellence, dedicated patriotism, and exemplary bravery."

Mr. Speaker, there is no Member of this House more supportive of the 415,000 men and women of the United States Armed Forces over in the Persian Gulf or of the 158,000 members of the Reserves and National Guard who have been called to active duty than I. I fully support them in their efforts and pray that this war will quickly be over and that they will return safely and soon.

Had Senate Concurrent Resolution 2 not linked the commendation for the actions of the President and the support of our troops to-

gether, I would have voted against this Presidential action to place our young people in harms way, but a resounding "aye" in support of our young men and women who are either involved in or faced with armed conflict.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I shall probably record my presence when the vote occurs, but want our allies as well as our troops and their families to know that I fully support them.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. OWENS].

Mr. OWENS of Utah. Mr. Speaker, it was with a mixture of horror and revulsion that I followed the news of an Iraqi missile attack on densely populated coastal cities in Israel. We watched as innocent civilians prepared for nerve gas to penetrate their homes and their sealed rooms. We witnessed the birth of a new, ghastly image on our televisions—that of reporters, with eyes obscured and words garbled, speaking to us through gas masks. We saw the destruction wrought on a city block by an Iraqi Scud missile, and marveled in relief that no human life was taken.

The entire world faces an enemy today that not only disregards the safety of civilian non-combatants, but deliberately targets them. I take great pride that American and allied forces, in contrast, have sought to minimize civilian casualties and strike only at military targets.

I rise to join my colleagues today in expressing the unified support of the Congress and the Nation for the Commander in Chief and for our brave men and women who are daily risking their lives in Operation Desert Storm. I hope and pray that this terrible undertaking may be brought to a swift, decisive, and victorious conclusion with truly minimal cost to human life, American, allied, or Iraqi.

We have been urged—and I think wisely—to avoid euphoria, even as we learn of thousands of successful air missions and the remarkable conduct thus far of this operation. I think we have a long and painful road ahead. If we are to send any message, Mr. Speaker, to our troops in the field, it should be that we are proud of you. We are grateful for your courage and resolve. And we pledge our undying support for you in the dark days ahead.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY].

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, which expresses the Congress' unequivocal support for the U.S. troops in the Persian Gulf.

Mr. Speaker, there are approximately 14,500 Active, Reserve, and National Guard personnel from Kansas who have been deployed in support of Operation Desert Shield and Desert Storm. Leading the way is the famed First Infantry Division—Fort Riley—the Big Red One, which has fought in both world wars, and in Vietnam. The Kansas Air National Guard's 190th Air Refueling Group, Topeka, was deployed to Saudi Arabia just days after Iraq invaded Kuwait. Also deployed are the Army National Guard's 170th Maintenance Unit, Hays, and the following Army Reserve units: the 13th Quartermaster Co., Great Bend; the 13th Water Purification Co. Great Bend; the 467th Firefighters Unit, Garden City; the 456th Movement Control Unit, Manhattan;

the 410th Field Hospital Detachment, Topeka; the 842d Field Service Detachment, Kansas City; the 368th Finance Support Detachment, Wichita; the 1011th Quartermaster Support Co., Independence; the 475th Firefighting Detachment, El Dorado; the 129th Heavy Truck Co., Osage City; and the 531st Transportation Co.

Six days ago, Mr. Speaker, this House voted to give the President authority to use force against Iraq.

We all hoped he would never have to use it.

I recognize that there is some disagreement around the country—and in this Chamber—about our policies in the Persian Gulf.

But whether or not we support these policies, it is important that we stand behind our Armed Forces.

Mr. Speaker, while I was in the Persian Gulf last week, the question that I was most often asked was whether the American people and the Congress of the United States supported our troops that were there. That was the question I was most often asked.

Mr. Speaker, with the passage of this resolution today, I hope that those brave men and women will understand that they are overwhelmingly supported in their efforts by the people of this country and the Congress of the United States.

My heart goes out to our troops and their families who are serving our country during this dangerous hour of need. Their courage and selfless dedication to duty is an inspiration to me and to all Americans.

I urge our country to unite and to pray earnestly for the safe return of all of our young men and women serving in the Persian Gulf.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RITTER].

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, as the war in the Persian Gulf approaches the end of its second day, the signs of our success continue to be encouraging and there is cause for cautious optimism. The battle has just begun.

Now is truly the time for the Congress and the American people to unify behind our men and women in the field. I join Americans across the country in hoping and praying we will get Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait as quickly as possible with the absolute minimum loss of life.

I take heart in the superb performance of our men and women in the field. We are witnessing a remarkable team effort that extends all across the gulf and over land and sea to the shores of the United States itself.

In addition to the pilots in the air and the front liners on the ground, superb work is being done by those who support our troops in the field, logistics, intelligence, maintenance, transportation, medical, and so many others.

To paraphrase the words of a patriot from another country and another time, this is their finest hour.

Some are unsure of our purpose. People in my own district have demonstrated against our use of force. I respect their right to express themselves. It is a right that makes America great.

I find it ironic, however, that these people have seen fit to denounce the United States' use of force and the United Nations' use of allied force to liberate Kuwait, but have remained deafeningly silent at the use of Soviet force to subjugate Lithuania.

□ 1510

And as we pass this resolution which brings together the U.S. Congress behind our soldiers in the field, even though many Members have previously voted to deny the President the same support just a few days ago, I would urge the American people to also unify behind our President and troops and show Saddam Hussein that his war—and make no mistake about it, it is his war—will never be won in the United States of America.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. SWETT].

Mr. SWETT. Mr. Speaker, a week ago, this House was divided on whether to authorize the President to use force against the brutal dictator of Iraq, Saddam Hussein. Today, Mr. Speaker, this House is united in support for the brave American men and women who are carrying on the fight against Iraq.

What has happened over this last week? The Secretary General of the United Nations was rebuffed and humiliated by Saddam Hussein on his mission of peace to Baghdad. Saddam Hussein rejected out of hand a last-minute effort of the Government of France to avert war. Last night, the civilian population of Israel was wantonly attacked without provocation. These brutal actions only confirm the correctness of the bipartisan decision we made less than a week ago.

Mr. Speaker, the American people and this House have coalesced around our troops and their military commanders. I urge my colleagues to vote for the resolution of support for our military forces that is before us today.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting and proper that we should be in this Chamber today sending a heartfelt message to our men and women in the Persian Gulf region to tell them, rhetorically, something that is not precisely true. And that is

that all America supports our fighting men and women.

How do we put it in this resolution? That "Congress and the American people have the greatest pride in the men and women of the United States and support them in their efforts."

The President said that this morning, and he also misspoke and he knows that. He watches television regularly. There are 14 percent of the people who in the latest scientific polls do not support the President's policies. Some—I hope most of those 14 percent—support the men in uniform. But some surely don't. We know that the United States is the last country in the world where Marxism teachers who thrive on our college campuses, are still respected. These professors have sent some of their pampered students into the streets to show their contempt for our fighting men and women in the field. It is a cultural and historical fact that a lot of American men sought a teacher's credential during the Vietnam war to avoid service. They milked Robert McNamara's policy encouraging them to stay in school. These draft evaders are teaching in high schools now, 15, 20 years later, and sending high school students into the streets to express their contempt for our system, for our country—not all of them, but some of them.

The media does not show this 14 percent on TV in correct proportion. I see 30 to 50 percent of the television coverage, depending on the market, spent on people out in the streets trying to burn American flags.

My two sons, grown men in their thirties, stopped five American flags that had been taken down from a Federal flagpole on Wilshire Boulevard from being burned. This was after the crowd had been inflamed first by Ron Kovich—the Purple Heart hero turned professional malcontent—and then by an FLNM Communist terrorist from Central America still blabbering on about mining harbors in Central America.

Now, that is an ugly scene, and the media had better get their act together and quit dwelling on this lunatic, left-wing fringe and begin to show the other 86 percent.

Now, this resolution has been described as a political figleaf for some Members of this body who want to cover their vote last week. I said in the well that a vote on either side was honorable because some, truthfully, analyzed that sanctions might work. But it seems now that this will be a figleaf for the political keisters of some who still come to the well and saying in a begrudging way that, "Well, maybe we should have waited."

Wasn't last night's Hitler-style terror-weapon shelling enough to convince you of the rightness of our cause? This attack was aimed at grandparents and women and children. Some people, in

panic, began sticking themselves prematurely with needles meant to fend off nerve gas that never came. There were two grandmothers who may have died because they could not get the plastic off of their gas masks and they may have suffocated to death. This man, Saddam Hussein, has to be taken out now for all his war crimes. And, yes, this body should vote unanimously as did the Senate to let those men and women over there know that these demonstrators in the street, not the respectful ones carrying the flag and still taking exception to the violence of war, but those who are burning the flag, mouthing hatred for our country do not represent public opinion. They are such a tiny exception that it is time the media stop showing these jerks who mouth hatreds for the United States and our policy and calling us an imperialist country. The media should give them the half of a percent of the media time that they earn by their numbers. Do not cut away from the weather, from sports, from gulf reports, from combat situation reports, from the White House, to go to some pathetic Marxist-taught student, some pampered child in the street, or some older hippie who looks like he stepped out of a 1960's time capsule expressing hatred for our country.

Let us vote unanimously today for this excellent figleaf resolution.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON].

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. McCLOSKEY].

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, it should go without saying that every Member of this body supports our brave members of the Armed Forces in the gulf.

Their bravery, valor, and sacrifice can never receive adequate recognition. All of us hope that Saddam Hussein surrenders, leaves Kuwait and avoids further bloodshed. His Revolutionary Guard are being mass-bombed around the clock. If they do not die within days, they will be insane within weeks.

Our prayers also are for President Bush in his role as Commander in Chief. The stresses and agonies he must undergo are surely most terrible.

But my vote for this resolution still is not an endorsement of a flawed policy whose most dangerous repercussions remain vast beyond prediction.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER].

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, because it expresses my strongest possible support for the brave American men and women of our military forces now serving in the war in

the Persian Gulf. I want to be clear that my support for this resolution should not be construed as an endorsement of the decision to deploy our military forces on January 16. I continue to believe that this conflict is not a wise use of our military or economic resources. This war is being fought plainly and simply on behalf of the oil interests of the Middle East. I believe the main beneficiaries of our efforts there will be our strongest economic competitors.

Mr. Speaker, from the very beginning, I have publicly dissented from the policies the President and the Congress are pursuing in the Persian Gulf. Neither the President nor the Congress has rethought what form our Nation's diplomatic and military policies should be in the post-cold-war era. Sadly, we are still behaving as the super cop of the world. As a result, we have embarked upon a war that is not serving, but will actually damage, our economic and foreign interests for years to come.

While we are wasting our economic resources and the lives of our precious young people in this war, we are also most assuredly weakening our ability to confront the urgent domestic problems facing our Nation. We are a nation that can quickly deploy troops on the other side of the planet to aid others, yet we cannot afford to fix our own roads and bridges, improve our water and sewer systems, restore our rail and air transportation infrastructure, or enhance our education and health care systems so that we can compete economically throughout the next century.

We are in the Persian Gulf today, plainly and simply, to defend the oil interests of the Middle East. Make no mistake about it—oil is the reason—and a reason that does not relate to our long-term vital national interest. We all know that we could be energy independent if we choose. Just ask the farmers of the Midwest.

The preservation of oil supplies for our economic competitors is not the proper use of our military. We cannot afford to strengthen our foreign rivals at our own expense. We should not be sending our sons and daughters into battle for the preservation of our competitors' economies. Indeed, the warfare of the 1990's and the next century is economic, not military.

Every dollar borrowed from Germany, Japan, and Arab nations to finance this war weakens our Nation's economy and our Nation's future. Repaying that additional debt will ultimately translate into a decreased standard of living for the average American, as a consequence of this military adventure.

The nations that stand to benefit the most from our efforts are unwilling to use their resources in this affair—they do not have to—they know America will do it for them. I believe we are being "Tom Sawyered"; the whole world has us whitewashing their fence. They've gotten us to volunteer to do the job; and they have even gotten us to pay for the privilege.

And so Mr. Speaker, I reiterate my unqualified support for our young men and women serving in Operation Desert Storm, but also note my disapproval of the policies that led our Nation to war.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the

gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MCCURDY].

Mr. MCCURDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution and only to add that obviously we support our men and women in uniform performing so valiantly. But I think it is important that this body stand as well to try to bring reality to the situation and realize that there is a certain euphoria in the country because of the initial success, but this will be a sustained and serious and long effort.

We all hope and pray that it will be over as quickly as possible.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GEREN].

Mr. GEREN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of our courageous men and women in the Middle East and in support of our President and in support of this resolution.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES].

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 2. The time has come to put aside our differences and close ranks behind our President, our troops, and our allies in the Persian Gulf.

A united America is a strong America. Our top priority must be to support our forces as they courageously fight to free Kuwait and stop Saddam Hussein.

Let us join together in supporting our fighting men and women, and let us pray that they can bring this sad chapter in world history to a speedy conclusion, with a minimum of casualties.

The strategy employed by the allied forces has minimized casualties by the use of precise strikes at military targets. Not only is this strategy commendable, it again demonstrates the difference between the United States of America and dictators like Saddam Hussein. We place a great value on life itself.

Iraq's indiscriminate use of highly inaccurate missiles to attack Israel, a country that had done nothing to provoke such an attack, is another act of irresponsibility and outrage.

We are extremely proud of our forces. They are the best trained and best armed fighting force in history. Their professionalism and courage should be commended by all. They also deserve our country's eternal gratitude.

And when this conflict is resolved, I hope that we will work just as hard at developing a comprehensive solution to some of the longstanding problems in the Middle East. We must develop a lasting formula for peace, so that such conflicts will be avoided in the future.

This crisis has highlighted the importance of a strong United Nations. We need to strengthen the United Nations, and lay the groundwork for mobilizing

international forces in the future in a way that will not depend upon the United States to supply the bulk of the fighting force.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this resolution, and I urge all Americans to join me in supporting our troops as they confront Saddam Hussein.

□ 1520

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, this is a solemn moment for all of us as we await word on the fate of our loved ones in the Persian Gulf. Regardless of our feelings about the course of action the President has chosen, our hearts go out to the young men and women who willingly shoulder such an awesome responsibility in behalf of our country. We remember them in our prayers, as we ask for their safe return and also for the protection of innocent civilians throughout the Middle East.

I want to send a special message of appreciation to the courageous young people of my home State of New Jersey, and to their families. You are never out of my thoughts. Our communities stand by you and wish you Godspeed.

I still fervently believe that sanctions should have been given more opportunity to work.

Mr. Speaker, I continue to hope that we will reach a point when we can sit down and talk out our differences. Diplomacy and peaceful negotiations have worked in the past; I pray that we will not forever abandon these means of resolving conflicts as we strive to build a better and more stable world.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I completely support the men and women of our Armed Forces who are the foundation for the security of our country and of all of us who live in this country, and our relationships, of course, with other nations of the world. I say this, Mr. Speaker, even though I am still firm in my opposition to going to war at this time. I thought and still believe that there could have been time to allow sanctions to work.

Mr. Speaker, I completely support the men and women of our Armed Forces. They are the foundation for the security of our Nation and of all of us who live in this Nation in our relationship and intercourse with other nations of the world. They are now doing a most admirable job under most adverse circumstances and we take pride in their attitudes and achievements. They will continue to do their jobs bravely, conscientiously, and effectively.

I shall continue to support them as this resolution proposes despite the fact that I voted against the resolution of last week which granted the President of the United States

congressional authority to activate our Armed Forces in a war against Iraq. I still am firm in my opposition to going to war at this time. I thought and still believe the President should have allowed the sanctions more time to cripple the economy of Iraq.

The President, however, has decided to take our country to war at this time. We pray that the war will be won as quickly and with as few casualties as possible.

I must also extend my admiration to the people of Israel who are faced with having to bear the brunt of the battle without the freedom to retaliate against an Arab foe as has been their policy since Israel was established. They have shown restraint against retaliation for the missiles that have already been showered upon their country by Iraq. Iraq will continue to aim its missiles at Israel, and we hope damage will be inconsequential as that damage caused by the first missiles. The time may come when Israel, in self-defense, will have no option but to retaliate against Iraq.

We pray, too, Mr. Speaker, that one of the results of this horrendous conflict will be the agreement by Israel's foes to make peace with it rather than to continue their war against it.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. VALENTINE].

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] for yielding to me.

I have a prepared statement which will be made a part of the RECORD, but I want to use my 1 minute to say that I supported the President with hesitation and reservations. I support this resolution without any reservations whatsoever. But I would like to introduce into the debate a matter that I have heard very little, if anything, about.

One of the problems with the Vietnam conflict was that we required only a part of our citizens to make a sacrifice. I call on the President of the United States to send a message to the Congress advising us on how we should fund this war. It is not fair for us to ask for so much sacrifice from part of our citizens and not explain how we will pay, how we will bear this burden, in any way except to pass the obligation along to our children and grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, we should not require these young men and women to fight and make the sacrifice and then come home and help pay for it.

Now I want to support the troops, but I suggest to my colleagues that there should be enough sacrifice here to go around. We should be required to pay as we go for this war.

Mr. Speaker, like every American, I regret that war in the Persian Gulf has become necessary. We have all followed news of the conflict with feelings of great pride in the performance of our military personnel mixed with great apprehension about the challenges and dangers they will continue to face in the days ahead.

What is clear, even at this early stage, is that the American forces are performing their

mission with the highest degree of professionalism, effectiveness, and heroism. The great successes that have already been achieved are a tribute to the skill and dedication of every American in the gulf. They are doing an unwelcome job as well as it can be done.

What is also clear is that the allied coalition will achieve our objective. The Iraqi forces will be driven from Kuwait.

Ultimate victory by the allied coalition should now be apparent even to Saddam Hussein. I am hopeful that he will finally realize that continued intransigence in the face of a united world community will only result in further damage to his nation and suffering by the Iraqi people. The Iraqi dictator can avoid this additional devastation and tragedy simply by giving back what he has taken.

While victory is certain, we must focus clearly on the formidable obstacles that our forces must overcome before that goal is attained. The Iraqi military, crippled as it now appears to be, still poses a deadly threat to our troops.

For that reason, it is vital that the Congress join the American people in expressing unequivocal and total support for our forces in the gulf. We in the Congress must ensure that they have the tools to accomplish the task that has been given to them.

We must also ensure that they know that the nation that has sent them halfway around the world is united solidly behind them. They need our prayers as well as our hardware.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of our colleagues to join in this expression of support. Last week in the Chamber I enumerated several questions about policy that remain unanswered. Those issues still need to be addressed, but that must take a back seat to meeting the needs of our troops. Those who are making the largest sacrifices and risking their very lives deserve our full backing.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT].

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution means, among other things, that a decision has been made last Friday, here in this Chamber and in the other body, by Congress. That decision authorized the President of the United States to use force to see that Iraq withdraws from Kuwait. As a result, the President has committed 400,000 American troops and the troops of other nations to military action to achieve that goal.

Mr. Speaker, I support that goal and have from the beginning. I still believe, however, that there were preferable and peaceful options to achieve the goal, but I also recognize that the time for that decision has passed.

The decision has been made, and now what we are called upon to do is to support our troops who have been committed to military action in that part of the country as a result of the actions of this body and of the President.

Mr. Speaker, that is what this resolution does, and I support it.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I have thought very carefully about the legislation before the House, and have tried to be as analytical and painstaking as possible in making my decision on how to vote on this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, were this simply a straightforward resolution which expressed our support for the troops in the gulf, I would support it with enthusiasm, for it has never been a matter of debate in my mind that our troops must have our backing, especially when they are in harm's way. In fact, my opinion that they were being sent unnecessarily into harm's way was my most potent motivation for opposing the use of force in this crisis. I take this stance without any need for interpretation or justification.

Mr. Speaker, if this were a straightforward resolution supporting the president and his actions as Commander in Chief, I would rise in opposition to it for the same reasons I have risen in opposition to the position which has advocated a military solution throughout this crisis.

I am particularly distressed that we have been presented with an unamendable measure which is designed intentionally to blur the distinction between those two positions. Support for our troops is not even a matter of debate: We all come together on that. And the Congress last week debated with great dignity and eloquence the question of whether or not to go to war in the Middle East. The sincerity of those who argued on both sides of this question cannot be doubted.

But this measure demands that members, in declaring their backing of our Armed Forces, also declare that, and I quote: " * * * the Congress commends and supports the efforts and leadership of the President as Commander in Chief in the Persian Gulf hostilities." I do not dispute the fact that the Congress, with significant opposition, gave the President the authority to wage this war. But it was the President, as Commander in Chief, that decided to use force at the first opportunity, rather than give economic sanctions further time to work. I cannot, in good conscience, cast my vote to commend the Commander in Chief for such a decision.

I regret that this legislation is put before us in this manner. It does the Nation a disservice to cloud this important issue with ambiguity. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, after serious and lengthy consideration, I come to the conclusion that the only legitimate position for me to take on this resolution, is to vote "present".

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution, and in a few moments, in a special order, I will address this issue at greater length.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the

gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ERDREICH].

Mr. ERDREICH. Mr. Speaker, the stunning events of the last 2½ days have given all of us pause to reflect on the course upon which we have now embarked. The President concluded, in keeping with the resolution passed by the Congress last week, which I supported, that all appropriate diplomatic and other peaceful means to obtain Iraqi compliance with the U.N. resolutions would not be successful.

All of us hoped that the use of U.S. Armed Forces would not become necessary. Our thoughts and prayers are with the men and women in our armed services and the allied forces involved in the Persian Gulf. We all hope for a swift resolution of the conflict and for peace to be restored in this region and throughout the world.

I strongly endorse the passage of this concurrent resolution supporting our Armed Forces. The information we have received shows that our men and women have performed in an exemplary fashion. Over these last few days, our military effort has been superbly planned and executed, from General Powell, through the chain of command, to our pilots, ground crews, ship crews, technicians and all who have made this effort possible, including the over 5,000 reservists from Birmingham and Alabama, and the additional regular service personnel from Alabama on duty in the Persian Gulf.

For that we are thankful. We each individually, and as a nation, support the courageous men and women of our Armed Forces and their families. We pray for the successful conclusion of this mission and for the safe return of all those involved in the Persian Gulf.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT].

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I rise with heartfelt pride in the young men and women serving our Nation in Desert Storm and for the successes that they have achieved in the early hours of this war. I take special pride in the Air Force because three of the frontline units are stationed in my State, and the architect and commander of the war in the air is Lt. Gen. Charles A. Horner who is based in my district at Shaw Air Force Base, the headquarters of the 9th Air Force.

Before the war started, skeptics wondered if all this technology would work on the battlefield as well as it worked on the testing ranges. The Air Force, under General Horner's superb leadership, has answered the skeptics and made us proud. This war is not over by any means, but it was begun with a battle plan that was as brilliantly executed as it was conceived.

Mr. Speaker, I salute all the men and women who are serving us in Desert Shield and Desert Storm, and I urge support from everyone for this resolution.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAY].

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 2.

I support United Nations Resolution 678, the Solarz-Michel resolution passed by this House, and the decisive action which President Bush has taken in the Persian Gulf. Saddam Hussein continues to show no intentions of leaving Kuwait, and Iraq remains relentless in defiance of United Nations resolutions.

The time for policy debate has now passed. It is time for us all to stand united with our President, with our courageous men and women in uniform, and with the dependents and loved ones of our soldiers.

Our continued success in the days ahead cannot be taken for granted, and we must refrain from excessive euphoria during this early stage of the military campaign. The possibility of danger spreading beyond the theater of war, and into cities across the world in the form of terrorism, is a reality.

We have a responsibility, during the days ahead, to console and comfort our Nation. It is important that we provide all possible relief to our service families to reassure them that the safety of their loved ones in the Persian Gulf is our highest priority. Patience, compassion, and prayer are key words that we must actively use in the days ahead.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, there are times for debate and for persuasion, and there are times for coming together and for the common pursuit of our national objectives.

When this body debated the authority to wage war in the Persian Gulf, I spoke against the early use of force and for giving sanctions more time to work. But Congress voted its assent to the President's policy, and war has commenced.

Now American soldiers are fighting against the forces of Saddam Hussein in the Persian Gulf, and they are performing in a courageous and heroic manner under very difficult conditions. It is important, at this stage, that the U.S. Congress and the American people all join together in expressing our strong support for the men and women of the Armed Forces. And it is important to express our fervent hopes and prayers that their mission will be swiftly accomplished with minimal loss of life.

The events of the last 24 hours are an indication that this war is far from over, and that many difficult moments lie ahead. The Iraqi missile attacks against Israel and Saudi Arabia are yet another confirmation that Iraq's brutal dictator cares little for the value of life and is a serious long-term threat to world peace. In particular, Saddam Hussein's indiscriminate missile attacks against a civilian population in Israel has filled the hearts of the civilized world with horror and deep sorrow.

The men and women of the Armed Forces have been called on to turn back the serious threat that is posed by Saddam Hussein and his forces to stability throughout the gulf region. In this task, which is being carried out with skill, professionalism, and bravery, we wish them godspeed.

This resolution is an expression of our solidarity with the Persian Gulf forces, and a way of expressing our heartfelt hopes for the early completion of their task, for their safety in the face of the Iraqi threat, and for their swift return to their homes and families. I urge my colleagues to join in strong support of these fundamentally important objectives.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, our thoughts and prayers and complete support are with the brave men and women now engaging in battle in the Persian Gulf.

Although the American people and Congress have been divided on the question of whether military action was the best option at this time, the decision has been made.

We must face the sobering reality that we are at war. We must stand united behind our troops. We must reach out to comfort and sustain their families.

We all hope that Saddam Hussein will quickly come to his senses, that the war will end soon, and that the casualties will be few.

Our prayers are also extended to all the peoples of the Middle East in the hopes that this war may somehow lead us to a greater understanding of their sufferings. And that this battle may give way to a profound and lasting peace.

But above all, to the men and women who carry our flag in the Persian Gulf today, with the passage of this resolution, we say to you—this nation owes you its gratitude and highest honors. We draw strength from your courage. We will care for your families. And we will stand by you both now and when you return home.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong support of this resolution and in strong support of our efforts in the Desert Storm operation.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished majority whip, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago I was walking through a hospital area in Dhahran when someone called out, "Reverend Gray."

His name was Nick Frederick. He was from north Philadelphia. He had been to my church. My father had married his parents.

It's young servicemen like Nick Frederick I think about as we discuss this resolution today.

It's a resolution that expresses support for our troops in the field. That is very different than the historic debate we had here last week.

During that debate I said I disagreed with the move from Desert Shield to Desert Storm.

Congress has spoken. The President made the decision and our troops are locked in combat.

I know what I want when that happens.

I want our troops to know we support them.

I want our troops to know we're praying for them.

I want our troops to know we want them home quickly.

And there's no doubt about the message this resolution sends Saddam Hussein: Don't confuse our divided opinions for a lack of resolve. Do not mistake the wonder of democracy for weakness.

One of the tragedies of war is that young men and women have to risk losing their lives in battle.

I think of the ones I met.

Like Debby Geiger, a young woman from the Lehigh Valley, a captain. I sat listening to her in Dharhan, as she talked about the important role women now play in the military.

Or like a tank crewman named MacIntosh, from northeast Philadelphia. We met him getting ready to ship out with his M1A1 tank for the front lines.

Last night, when I heard that an Iraqi Scud missile had come out of a launcher aimed for Dharhan, I did not think about policy debates. I thought of them.

Frederick. MacIntosh. Geiger.

This resolution is aimed at them. We want them to know we care. And when this is over we want to welcome them back home. I want to see Nick Frederick in my church again, and if he ever wants me to do a wedding ceremony—I will be there.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time on our side to the distinguished chairman of the Democratic Caucus, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, let me remind the Members of this House that a few days ago we participated in a solemn, serious, sometimes somber and gut-wrenching debate.

There were deeply held convictions debated and a decision was made. Democracy was on display—and I believe the American people, divided themselves, were all proud of their Congress.

Today we express our pride for those who serve our Nation in the Armed Services.

No, Mr. Speaker, we do not make policy today. That was done some days ago. Today, we proclaim our unity as a nation in support of our Commander in Chief and for our fellow citizens who are now in the Persian Gulf to accom-

plish the objectives of our country and the United Nations.

Last week we made it clear that Saddam Hussein's aggression against Kuwait must not be allowed to stand. The President decided to initiate the military effort to accomplish this end. American lives, and the lives of our allies, are on the line to accomplish a goal upon which there is no disagreement—aggression cannot be rewarded and the benefits of it must not be allowed to be retained. Our men and women on the front lines have our united national resolve to support their efforts to accomplish this end.

The military actions of our Armed Forces are carefully designed to avoid the targeting of civilian populations and religious sites in Iraq. We all support and applaud the decision to carefully target only military sites, and all of the efforts taken to quickly end this conflict with the absolute least loss of life.

It is clear that Saddam Hussein can end this conflict with one phone call—and the complete withdrawal of his troops from Kuwait. I urge Saddam Hussein to take advantage of the fact that America is not an imperialist power, nor one desirous of war. We do not seek to control Iraq or rule its land. We do not seek the destruction of the Iraqi people or their nation. We seek only the restoration of peace and the withdrawal of Saddam Hussein and his military machine from Kuwait.

The President has begun the military effort to accomplish this end. I stand with my colleagues in this House in support of our men and women who are bravely risking their very lives in the performance of their duties. They do not do so with gladness or with relish or with a sense of vainglory. They do so because they realize there is a job to do and they want to get it done as quickly as possible. They pray, and we join their prayer, that they return to us whole and well. They pray, and we join their prayer, for a quick end to the fighting and a return of peace to the Middle East—a Middle East secure from aggression. But they do more than pray. They are fighting and risking their lives. We owe them no less than our full support and the full support of the resources, prayers, and resolve of this great Nation to guarantee their success.

There are difficult days ahead. And, as we overwhelmingly rise to declare our firm support for our sons and daughters, husbands and wives, brothers and sisters, friends and neighbors in the Middle East, I would recall the words of our Speaker just last week:

I offer a public prayer for this House, for all of us, for the Congress, for our President—and he is our President—and for the American people, particularly those young Americans who stand willing to make the supreme sacrifice. May God bless us and guide us and help us in the fateful days that lie ahead.

□ 1540

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from the Virgin Islands [Mr. DE LUGO].

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority leader for yielding.

On behalf of the more than 200 Virgin Islands men and women who are at this minute serving our Nation in the Persian Gulf in Operation Desert Storm, I urge strong support for this resolution.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Tennessee [Mrs. LLOYD].

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, which expresses this body's support for the President's leadership during the gulf crisis and for the brave men and women serving in the Armed Forces who are so bravely and professionally carrying out their missions.

Mr. Speaker, last Saturday I voted in favor of authorizing the President to use force against Iraq, if Saddam Hussein refused to comply with U.N. resolutions calling for a complete and total Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait by January 15. It was my sincerest hope that Saddam Hussein would respond to a clear, unequivocal signal from Congress and the administration that the United States was prepared to stand shoulder to shoulder with the international community and enforce the U.N. resolutions.

Saddam Hussein failed to heed this body's warning and stubbornly rebuffed last minute peace efforts by the U.N. Secretary General, members of the European Community, and ever-present intermediaries like Jordan's King Hussein. In my judgment, President Bush and the international community responded appropriately and began the campaign to drive Saddam Hussein from Kuwait.

Early reports from the Middle East suggest that the United States and its allies will quickly control the skies over Iraq. America's Armed Forces deserve tremendous credit for this achievement. It is clear that America's service people are the best trained, best equipped, and most professional in the world. Their dedication, their willingness to risk their lives in the service of their country, and their heroism are superlative. All Americans owe our brave men and women in uniform their support and gratitude.

The President also deserves great praise for how he has handled the gulf crisis. His skillful diplomacy united the world against Saddam Hussein's brutal assault and rape of Kuwait. Before August 2, no one would have thought it possible to assemble a coalition involving the United States, the European Community, and the majority of the Arab world; nor would anyone have believed that the United Nations could function as an effective agent of collective security just as its founders had hoped. Yet, President Bush managed to accomplish both. His success is testament to the continued importance of American leadership in the world.

Now that the battle has been joined, to use the President's phrase, I believe the country must stand together and support our troops fighting in the Persian Gulf. Like many of my

colleagues, I was encouraged by reports after the first day of fighting, but as yesterday's Iraqi attack on Israel indicates, the conflict in the gulf is just beginning and predictions about its course and the ease with which we will achieve our objectives are premature at best, dangerous at worst. I am confident that we will be successful and will continue to support my President, our troops, and my country, but I understand that there is more conflict to come.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MOODY].

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, just 6 days ago, many Members in this House, including myself, supported the continuation of diplomacy and sanctions in the gulf crisis as an alternative to immediate war. This House and the Senate, however, voted to authorize the use of force after January 15, and we have now used that force.

We will never know what result might have come from having stayed the diplomatic course. We do know now, however, that our Nation is at war. We do know that the sons and daughters of all our many communities are engaged in the dangerous and unpredictable duty that falls to the Armed Forces in time of war.

Our purpose here today is not to revisit the debate over the policy that led us to war. My opposition to the policy and flawed assumptions that led us into what I feel is a premature use of offensive force has not diminished. My conviction that untold and unwanted consequences await us in the future has not receded. My heartache at the potential loss of innocent lives, on all sides of this conflict, has not lessened.

But, our purpose now is to unite behind our troops, and the President in his role as Commander in Chief.

Let no one, least of all Saddam Hussein, doubt that whatever the nature of our democratic debate may have looked like last Saturday, or next week, we are all united in praying for a swift conclusion to hostilities and we are also united in our support for our soldiers and their families. Congress will not deny our men and women in the field whatever they need to accomplish their mission.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot let this moment pass without making reference to last night's unprovoked Iraqi missile attack on Israeli civilian population centers. Despite significant provocation and threats from Saddam Hussein, Israel has maintained its reserve, and at great risk to itself, held its collective breath against a surprise attack from Iraq.

That attack has now come. The people of this tiny and easily reached democracy are now living within the shadow of terror from a desperate dictator. It is my earnest hope that last night's attack will be an isolated event, and that Israel will not be drawn into this conflict. But if they are, I believe Americans will understand that self-defense will be totally justified.

Contrast, if you will my colleagues, the careful attempts by the allied forces to restrict our military action to noncivilian military targets with the indiscriminate missile attack on purely civilian neighborhoods in Tel Aviv and Haifa.

Mr. Speaker, I join with this House and with the people of Wisconsin and Americans all across the country in declaring our unequivocal support for the brave young men and women in the Persian Gulf.

The ability to bring peace to the region now rests with Saddam Hussein, and only with Saddam Hussein.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LENT].

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of our President, our troops in the field, and in Senate Concurrent Resolution 2.

Last Saturday, when this House was considering what to do about Saddam Hussein's aggression, I was proud to voice my support for the President and his efforts to free Kuwait. At that time, I also expressed my confidence in the brave and dedicated men and women who serve in our Armed Forces. Following the events of the past week, I am very pleased to have another opportunity to do this and to discuss the situation in the Middle East.

Last night, the American people watched in horror as our enemy in the Persian Gulf conflict revealed that there is virtually no limit to his barbarity and inhumanity. The missile attack on civilian targets in and around Tel Aviv, Israel's largest city, is only the latest example of why we could afford to wait no longer to strip Saddam of his war machine.

While last night's missiles carried conventional warheads, there can be no doubt left about Saddam's willingness to use whatever weaponry he can get his hands on. He has already used chemical weapons on his own civilians and threatened to unleash his remaining stockpiles on our troops. It is indeed fortunate that Israel knocked out Iraq's Nuclear Research Program in 1981, because a world in which Saddam possesses a nuclear capability is too horrible to contemplate.

Mr. Speaker, the images that were broadcast last night of Israeli parents strapping gas masks on their infant children is one that will stay with me for as long as I live. Saddam, unable to effectively strike at military targets, lashed out at the civilian population of a country that was not involved in hostilities against him. For me, this clearly and unequivocally defines what is at stake now in the Persian Gulf for the United States and for the post-cold-war world.

President Bush knows that appeasing dictators is a prescription for disaster. The lesson that history offers us is clear—tyrants only grow stronger and bolder unless they are confronted and made to account for their deeds. In recognizing the threat Saddam poses to our way of life, to our friends, and to our allies, the President has provided this Nation and the world with extraordinary leadership.

The coalition that is now reversing Saddam Hussein's aggression is broad and diverse. Thanks to the President's skillful diplomacy it has already proven to be stronger and more cohesive than Saddam imagined. Last night was a particularly dark and uncertain night for the forces of freedom in the Middle East and there will certainly be more such nights ahead, but if anyone can maintain the fierce international pressure on Saddam Hussein it is George Bush. For this, he deserves our gratitude and our support.

Also deserving of the gratitude and support of this institution are our forces involved in Operation Desert Storm. By all accounts, our soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen have performed brilliantly during combat and in every aspect of this conflict. Clearly, the impressive level of success that has been achieved thus far is a tribute to their skill and courage.

Every American shares a deep and solemn concern for each of our servicemen and servicewomen on the front lines of the struggle against a kind of tyranny and repression that has never been seen before. Over the last 48 hours, the attention of the entire Nation has been riveted on these young men and women and they will continue to be in our thoughts until their safe return.

For many, the events of the last 2 days have placed a new light on the situation in the Persian Gulf. The extent of Saddam's evil and the necessity of destroying his arsenal now have been pointed out as never before. So, in closing, I want to praise the Members of this institution for coming together in this time of national urgency. I am pleased that so many who last week did not support the President have decided to do so at this time. I know he, like our troops in the field, will welcome and appreciate the sentiments expressed in this resolution as they undertake the difficult tasks that lie ahead.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, in the last 36 hours, the 400,000 American service men and women in the Persian Gulf have begun to implement Operation Desert Storm, the military action authorized by Congress and the President to liberate Kuwait. These courageous and capable young people represent our country and its unprecedented commitment to face down aggression and to protect the right to human freedom and self-determination. These are our values, values that lie at the very foundation of our Nation and the rock upon which our entire existence and institutions rest.

Along with the rest of America, I pray the military action in the Middle East will be short, American casualties will be light, and our sons and daughters will return to us soon. I also hope that the level of casualties among innocent Iraqi civilians—who have been dragged into this conflict by their cold and cruel dictator and with whom we have no quarrel—can be kept to an absolute minimum.

Whatever may happen in the coming days, we want our American service men and women and the President to know that the American people stand united behind them. We are grateful to each one of them for their dedication to our country and its values, for their bravery in confronting evil, and for presenting to the world the strength of moral purpose and hope that is the essence of America.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON].

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, January 12, 1991, the House of Representatives voted 250 to 183 to authorize the President of the United States to use military force, if necessary, to implement the United Nations' resolutions regarding Iraq and Ku-

wait. I voted for that resolution for the following reasons:

First, the President of Iraq, Saddam Hussein, has consistently ignored all appeals to remove Iraqi military forces from Kuwait. His military forces are in Kuwait because last August, Hussein ordered them there, against the will of the Kuwaiti people. In the 5 months of occupation the country of Kuwait has literally been raped and pillaged. Thousands of Kuwaitis have been killed and billions of dollars have been stolen. Every knowledgeable observer has verified this fact. Unless Hussein believes force will be used, he will not end the occupation and withdraw his troops.

Second, Saddam Hussein's ambitions do not end with Kuwait. Until President Bush acted to send troops to Saudi Arabia, there is clear evidence that Iraq was preparing to invade Saudi Arabia. If Saddam Hussein controlled Saudi Arabia and Kuwait, the oil reserves of those two countries combined with the oil reserves of Iraq would compromise almost half of the known oil reserves of the world. Saddam Hussein would have the power to strangle the United States and the world economically. This is simply not acceptable.

A third reason I voted for the resolution is because, at that point in time, there were no clear, obviously superior alternatives. The alternative of waiting for economic sanctions to work has appeal, but even those who support it do not claim the sanctions will succeed in 3 months or 6 months, or even another year. Fidel Castro has been in power in Cuba for over 30 years, and for most of that time Cuba has been under United States economic sanctions.

Fourth, and most importantly, to truly do everything possible to avert war, I believed it was imperative to leave no doubt in Saddam Hussein's mind that the U.S. Congress supports President Bush, and the United Nations, in the determination to use all means necessary, including the use of force, to free Kuwait and stop aggression.

That vote was Saturday. Today, we have another vote. I will vote "yes" on this vote also. Our military forces are engaged. They are winning. We must support them.

George Bush, as President of the United States, and as leader of the free world, has adopted a policy of stopping the aggression of Saddam Hussein, now, before things get out of hand. That policy is working and will continue to work only if the Congress and the American people stand steadfastly behind the President. The vote today, in my opinion, does supply just such steadfastness, and I strongly support this vote.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution today which states our strong and unequivocal support for the brave men and women of Operation Desert Storm. As these courageous Americans carry out the orders of their Commander in Chief, our thoughts and prayers go out to them and their families. Let there be no doubt that the American people and the U.S. Congress stand behind them as they carry out their duties in the name of freedom and the rule of international law.

It is already becoming apparent that Operation Desert Storm will involve not just a military effort, but a considerable political and diplomatic effort as well once the immediate military objectives of the coalition forces have been realized. While we are a long way from achieving all our goals, we must begin to project ahead. Many vexing questions will remain for U.S. policy in the region. We as a Congress must address these issues head on.

We will have to deal with the question of how we control Iraq's military in the future, and the shape of the political leadership in not just Iraq but Kuwait as well. What will the role of the United Nations be? How will the Soviet Union respond? And what will the role of the Gulf Cooperation Council and the Arab League be? The achievement of U.S. foreign policy goals in the Middle East will likely become more complicated as a result of this war, and it will be difficult for us to help our friends in the region cope with their long-standing economic and political problems. We must begin to consider not only foreign policy questions as a result of our involvement in the Middle East, but our domestic need to develop and implement a comprehensive energy policy. As our American troops work to liberate Kuwait, we must work to make clear our full support for them, and our willingness to provide the leadership on the difficult policy questions that will follow their military success.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, last week when we debated the issue of war in the Persian Gulf, I opposed the resolution giving the President the power to launch an offensive action against Iraq. My opposition to this resolution was based upon my strong belief that under our Constitution, only Congress has the authority to declare war. In my opinion when Congress gave President Bush the authority to take this Nation to war, Congress abdicated its constitutional prerogative to declare war.

As a Member of Congress, I had my day in court. I spoke against it—I voted against it. The other side won, and under our system and form of government the majority rules. It was my fervent hope that we could continue the sanctions imposed upon Iraq, continue our diplomatic efforts, and continue our massive military presence in the Persian Gulf in order to avert war, keep peace and save human lives.

Part of my desire to see war averted was Saddam Hussein's threat to the United States that if an offensive attack was launched upon Iraq that he would attack Israel. The whole Middle East situation is so fragile that we did not need to test Saddam Hussein on this issue. The dangers inherent in this threat alone were enough it seemed to me for our Nation to take extra steps to avert the execution of this threat. Today we find ourselves in war. The war was begun by President Bush who ordered American and allied troops to launch an attack upon Iraq. Last night pursuant to his threat that if he were attacked that he would attack Israel, Saddam Hussein did exactly that, he attacked Israel. This whole Middle East situation has now been exacerbated by the actions of our President.

I reach out today to the people of Israel who were nonparticipants and who did not provoke this unwarranted attack upon their people. I also commend them for the restraint they have

exercised under these difficult circumstances by acquiescing in the request of the United States not to counterattack against Iraq.

Today we are presented with debate and a vote on Senate Concurrent Resolution 2. I have agonized over how I shall vote on this resolution. I unequivocally support the men and women of our Armed Forces who are carrying out their missions with professional excellence, dedicated patriotism and exemplary bravery. I also totally support their families and loved ones.

In supporting this resolution today, as an American citizen, a World War II honorably discharged veteran, and a Member of Congress, I reserve the right to speak out against the policies of the President whenever I deem it necessary. My vote in favor of this resolution today is not a vote in favor of the policies of the President. My opposition to the policies which began this war were based upon my conscience. I must live with my conscience. This resolution is so worded that I cannot vote my conscience relative to the policies of the President and simultaneously vote to support our troops. My support for the troops is manifest and therefore I am voting "yes" on this resolution in order to demonstrate my support for them.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to vote in the affirmative on the resolution before us today with heavy emphasis on the unequivocal congressional support for our Armed Forces. But I would be less than honest to my constituents, my colleagues and most important, to myself were I not to qualify that vote with the following comments:

I am more convinced than ever that diplomatic pressure and economic sanctions were the correct policy to pursue. I feel this way because sanctions would have avoided the inevitable tragic consequences of conflict. In my judgment, even prolonged sanctions would have been less of a drain on the national economy than the cost of waging war.

But now our forces are engaged, and one can only pray for an early end of hostilities with minimal casualties.

With the resumption of peace, I look to this Congress and a cooperative administration, to address the pressing domestic issues once again delayed as national attention is focused and national treasure expended on these tragic events abroad.

I refer to housing and education and health care among the most critical of neglected social programs, along with efforts to combat crime and drug abuse.

Mr. Speaker, there is not a district in the United States in greater need than my own. But let it be recognized that these social ills are national in scope and massive federally financed remedies will be needed to cope with them. They cry out for attention. Let nothing deter us from these pressing obligations.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I wish to repeat my total support and admiration for our servicemen and women in the Persian Gulf. Their patriotism and courage are a source of national pride. My prayers are with them in these perilous days and it is indeed proper that we salute them and formally assure them of our whole-hearted support in this congressional resolution.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 2. I commend the leadership on both sides of the aisle for their work on this bipartisan resolution and for bringing it forward so quickly.

This resolution unequivocally supports the men and women of our Armed Forces, who are carrying out their missions with professional excellence, dedicated patriotism and exemplary bravery. I strongly endorse the sentiments of this resolution.

This resolution also commends and supports the efforts and leadership of the President as Commander in Chief in the Persian Gulf hostilities. I agree that the President deserves our commendation for his efforts in conducting this war.

Like all my colleagues, I hope that this conflict will be brought to a quick conclusion. I also hope that our military efforts will be guided by our political objectives. We should stick with the political objectives outlined by the President on August 8, 1990, and keep our attention focused on achievement of those goals. We should not risk losing the focus of our strategy nor the support of our coalition partners by adopting other goals.

Finally, I believe we need to think about our long-term strategy for security and stability in the Middle East. Winning the war and winning the peace are quite different. We hope that this conflict will end in a matter of days. This means we need to address now the questions we will face in the months and years ahead. We will need to work with our allies and friends in the region on behalf of a strategy that will restore a balance of power, make progress toward an Arab-Israeli peace settlement, address political and economic instability in the region, and create a stable structure for the security of the gulf.

Mr. Speaker, I commend you for bringing this resolution forward. And I urge adoption of Senate Concurrent Resolution 2.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Senate concurrent resolution supporting our service men and women in the Persian Gulf. We have been asked over the last few days to participate in the most agonizing decision of our political careers.

I did not support the bipartisan resolution to go to war. However, now that our troops have been committed to battle, the troops in Operation Desert Storm know that this country and this Congress are firmly behind their bravery and commitment.

Mr. Speaker, my yea vote for Senate Concurrent Resolution 2 is a vote in support of our troops. We pray that the situation they have been placed in due to the invasion of Kuwait by Saddam Hussein's Iraqi forces will soon be over. From Baltimore alone, Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm has called up the Mobile Battalion Contingency Group 0603 operational support attachment, the ACU-2 LCM 8 Detachment 2806 amphibious support unit, the 531st Medical Detachment and the 290th Military Police Company.

Additionally, I have been contacted by dozens of families in my district regarding their loved ones who are in Saudi Arabia, or who are currently being deployed to bolster the forces in the region. My prayers and blessings go out to those who are directly affected by

the gruesome concomitant affects of this war and I hope that the job can be done expeditiously so that our fighting women and men may be able to be reunited with their families as soon as possible.

Historically, both war and death have cast a diminishing light on mankind and the lasting and great achievements of the world. As our troops carry out their mission under the U.S. flag, may God continue to watch over them, our country and the innocent noncombatants caught in harm's way. All life is sacred and precious before God.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, last week Congress conducted the debate over the use of force against Iraq required by our Constitution. That debate demonstrated the strength of this democracy. Now that force has been authorized and used, the world should know that we are united in our support of the military efforts to achieve our goals.

Our hearts go out to the 430,000 American men and women on the front lines, and to those of the allied forces. They are giving us their all, with skill, professionalism and courage, and have achieved stunning early successes.

They deserve, and we freely offer, our pride, respect, and support. More than anything else, we want them to complete their mission successfully and come home safely as soon as possible.

Much remains to be done, and I have no doubt that our forces will achieve the goals of this conflict. They are important goals. Iraq cannot be allowed to invade and plunder a neighbor. Its unprovoked missile attack last night on the cities of Israel was an outrageous act of terror against innocent citizens, clearly intended to broaden the war and weaken the allied coalition. This is yet more evidence of the importance of turning back Saddam Hussein's aggression and removing his ability to terrorize the region.

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to state unequivocally that I support our forces who are currently deployed in the Persian Gulf. It's my sincere hope that these brave men and women will soon return home unharmed. Mr. Speaker, in spite of my support for our troops I feel that their mission could have been averted if the President had continued to pursue our objectives through peaceful means.

Mr. Speaker, as I watch the events unfold in the Persian Gulf, I am more convinced of the futility of war. Mr. Speaker, war is not the answer, no one wins and everyone loses.

I still say let's give peace a chance. Mr. Speaker, because of my unwavering belief in the sanctity of peace and the absurdity of war, I am voting "no" on the resolution before us.

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the brave men and women of Desert Storm. While we may have differed on whether to authorize the use of force in the Persian Gulf, all of us are united in our admiration of the outstanding job being done by our servicemen and women in the gulf. They are putting their lives on the line in order to ensure the stability of the region, and indeed the entire world, as we stand up to a brutal and reprehensible dictator.

The initial attempts to destroy Iraq's lethal military arsenal and liberate Kuwait have been remarkable. Over 2,000 Iraqi strategic sites

have already been hit with an 80-percent success rate. Allied casualties have been minimal. The allied military has shown enormous caution and expertise in avoiding civilian targets in Iraq. We should all be proud of their humane efforts to avoid harm to the innocent. The impressive performance of our Armed Forces deserves the highest admiration. We must all stand united in our support of these courageous men and women and hope that each and every one of them returns home safely.

Standing in stark contrast to our reverence for innocent civilian life is Saddam Hussein's unconscionable attempt to bring Israel into the conflict by attacking urban areas in the heart of Tel Aviv. This cynical attack further reveals the ruthlessness and brutality of this tyrant. We already know Saddam has used every weapon he has gotten his hands on, including chemical gas, on his own people. We have no way of knowing whether the allied bombing of strategic sites has reduced or eliminated the threat of chemical attack. The risk remains that Saddam will still load his Scud missiles with chemical warheads, and may still be capable of unleashing them on civilian populations throughout the region.

Aside from Kuwait itself, Israel has suffered some of the gravest consequences of Iraqi aggression. Congress should commend Israel for the tremendous restraint and courage she has displayed in absorbing a first attack and withholding any retaliation so as not to threaten the cohesion of the anti-Iraq coalition. Israel has risked the lives of her own citizens who continue to live in fear of yet another Iraqi attack. No greater sacrifice can be demanded of any nation. I wish to express my sincere remorse for the losses our democratic ally Israel has incurred.

We all feel sadness and anguish that the anticipated tranquility of the post-cold-war world was so abruptly shattered by Iraqi aggression. We pray that our unity and the skill and determination of our troops will bring a swift end to this conflict and will usher in a new era of peace.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, in the 8 years since I was first elected to the Congress, I have never voted "present" on any bill or resolution. Today, I find that, if I am to be true to my conscience and to those I serve, I must break with my past record.

I cannot oppose a resolution which rightly praises the remarkable performance of U.S. troops in the Persian Gulf. The men and women stationed in the gulf deserve the recognition of this body for the nearly flawless execution of the airstrikes against Iraq. They deserve our admiration for the tremendous personal sacrifices they are making in order to serve our Nation in the Persian Gulf.

And yet, I cannot in good conscience offer the same praise and support to a Commander in Chief who has drawn us needlessly into war, a war which will cost us lives abroad, and deep social and economic sacrifices here at home.

Having consistently expressed my support for a diplomatic solution to the Persian Gulf crisis, and having voted against the authorization of any offensive military action in the gulf, I cannot indulge in the hypocrisy of applauding a U.S. military attack now that it has begun.

I am voting "present" to let the troops, and their loved ones, know that I recognize and support the valiant efforts of United States troops in the mission against Iraq. I am voting "present" to tell the same troops, and loved ones, that I regret that we, as a nation, did not give sanctions an opportunity to work.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for the resolution before us. Let me also clearly express my strong support for our President, and for our brave men and women engaged in this war in the Persian Gulf.

Any past differences of opinion are behind us now. We are united together as one country. We are united together as Americans, committed to repelling Iraq's wanton aggression.

During last week's debate each of us was called upon to exercise our individual judgment on how to best serve the vital interests of our Nation at that particular moment in time.

Different people reached different conclusions. However, when the voting was complete, our democratic system had produced a decision. The Congress of the United States of America authorized the President to take whatever steps he believes necessary in the Persian Gulf.

I said at that time, and I reaffirm here today, my support for our troops is unwavering. I stand solidly beside our President as he undertakes his grave responsibility as Commander in Chief of our Nation's Armed Forces.

The President has made the determination that now is the time to use military force to bring an end to Saddam Hussein's brutal aggression against Kuwait.

Let no one doubt that this is precisely what we shall do. Iraq will be forced from Kuwait, and Saddam Hussein will be dealt a crushing defeat.

I am confident the President will do everything in his power to see that our casualties are kept to a minimum. He can be assured that he and our troops have my unqualified support, as well as that of the Congress.

Although initial reports from the field are encouraging, the loyal Americans serving in the gulf will continue to be in our prayers in the difficult days and weeks ahead.

We wish them Godspeed, a swift victory, and a safe early return to their loved ones back home.

I thank God that our country is blessed with people such as these dedicated Americans who are so unselfishly making great sacrifices, and enduring enormous personal hardships, for their Nation and the principles of liberty and justice which it embodies.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, I voted against the use of force as a means to resolve the crisis in the gulf. I am saddened by the failure of diplomacy in averting war. However, with war having begun, I am steadfast in my support for the men and women in our Armed Forces who are serving in the Persian Gulf during this difficult time. Our Nation and its leaders must not waver in their support for our military personnel.

War not only takes a high toll on the Armed Forces, it affects the families and loved ones of service men and women as well. My prayers are with these families who bear a special burden in this war. The suffering and separa-

tion endured by these families and the service men and women in the Persian Gulf is unfortunately an unavoidable part of war.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak today on behalf of the concurrent resolution supporting the U.S. actions in the Persian Gulf over the past 2 days. All of us have watched with interest and anticipation as the news reports have brought the success of the Desert Storm operation home to us.

This resolution, appropriately, expresses the pride that we here in the Congress have in the brave men and women who are serving in the Middle East, and our continuing support for their efforts. Mr. Speaker, I do want to say a personal note about the success we have witnessed so far in this operation, particularly the demonstration of the technical superiority of the weaponry that we as a Congress have provided to our Armed Forces.

Having served on the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee for the past 12 years, I am encouraged that many of these highly sophisticated systems have, in fact, done what they were supposed to do. They have given the United States and allied forces a margin of superiority that has saved lives, and that has made a swifter victory more possible.

The ability of our electronic systems to evade and counter the defenses of the Iraqis has underscored the importance of the very significant investment we have made in high-technology weapons over the past decade, and I think it is important to note this fact as we consider this resolution today.

Of course, I join all of my colleagues here in the House in hoping and praying that the Persian Gulf conflict will be resolved as quickly as possible; that the superiority of our weapons, the bravery of our military personnel, and the wisdom of the joint military leadership in the gulf will result in the successful achievement of all the goals of the United Nations.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. Although I did not agree with the decision to go to war, the decision to do so was made openly and democratically and constitutionally by the Congress and by the President. That issue—for better or for worse, has been settled; other issues concern us now.

American troops deserve, and I believe they have, the full support of this Congress and of the citizens we represent. They are in our prayers and in our hearts. We mourn the few, but still too many, who have died. We hope fervently that all our service men and women will be returning home safely and soon.

The people of Israel deserve this afternoon both our admiration and our respect. Their restraint in the face of danger has contributed greatly to the allied cause. We pray that the attack last night will have no successor, and that Israel will not become involved more deeply in this war.

Saddam Hussein deserves the burden of responsibility for the violence we have witnessed over the past 2 days. It was his decision to initiate war with Kuwait. His decision to ignore the United Nations. His decision to rebuff peace initiatives from nation after nation. And his decision to ignore repeated warnings that war would inevitably come. Now, it will be his decision whether to prolong this war, and to

extend the suffering of his people, or to yield his illegal claims and withdraw from Kuwait in peace.

President Bush deserves both our continued prayers and our continued counsel. It is no secret that neither our people nor this Congress were united about the decision to go to war. And while I believe the President will have the support of all Americans in his effort to bring this conflict to an early and successful conclusion, war cannot be used as an excuse to stifle free debate in this country. The course of events does not run clear. Decisions will have to be made on a daily basis about military tactics, diplomatic initiatives, economic controls and planning for the aftermath of war. As these decisions are made, the President will deserve, and surely benefit from, the free expression of public and congressional views.

In closing, I want to reiterate my support, respect and concern for our Armed Forces. I urge the President to conduct this war in a manner that minimizes the risks to them. And I urge all Americans to pray for an early peace.

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the citizens of Tennessee's Fifth Congressional District I rise today in strong support of the resolution. I want to take this opportunity to voice my continued support for the United Nations, the President, and the men and women of the armed services of the United States and our allies present in the Persian Gulf. As a lieutenant colonel in the Tennessee Air National Guard, I particularly want to convey the prayers and thoughts of my fellow citizens for the 6,000 soldiers, sailors, and airmen from the State of Tennessee serving in Operation Desert Storm. The units serving are:

TENNESSEE ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

130th Rear Area Operations Center (RAOC), Smyrna.
176th Maintenance Battalion, Johnson City.
776th Maintenance Company, Elizabethton and Trade.
251st Service and Supply Company, Tullahoma and Lewisburg.
1175th Quartermaster Company, Carthage and Lafayette.
212th Engineer Company, Dunlap and Monteagle.
1174th Quartermaster Company, Dresden.
663d Medical Detachment, Smyrna.
268th Military Police Company, Ripley.
300th Mobile Army Surgical Hospital, Smyrna.
196th Field Artillery Brigade, Chattanooga.
1/181st Field Artillery Battalion, Chattanooga and Dayton.
155th Engineer Company, Waverly and Erin.
775th Engineer Detachment, Camden.
269th Military Police Company, Dyersburg.
118th Public Affairs Detachment, Nashville.

TENNESSEE AIR NATIONAL GUARD

134th Air Refueling Group, Knoxville.
151st Air Refueling Squadron, Knoxville.
18th Combat Communications Squadron, Knoxville.
118th Tactical Airlift Wing, Nashville.
118th Combined Aircraft Maintenance Squadron, Nashville.
The 3397th Reserve Garrison, of Chattanooga.
The 3346th Medical Detachment, of Fort Knox, Ky.

The 360th Quartermaster Detachment, of Memphis.

The 401st Military Police Camp, of Nashville.

The 306th Medical Company (Clearing), of Nashville.

The 332d Medical Brigade, of Nashville.

The 639th Transportation Company, of Kingsport.

The 212th Transportation Company, of Chattanooga.

The 382d Medical Detachment, of Nashville.

The 912th Surgical Hospital, of Johnson City.

The 678th Personnel Services Company, of Nashville.

The 807th Surgical Hospital, Paducah, Ky.

The 377th Combat Support Hospital.

These men and women have been asked to make a tremendous sacrifice and have responded admirably. Tennesseans have always taken great pride in their reputation as the Volunteer State.

I want to pay special tribute to the 164th Mobile Aerial Port Squadron, of Memphis, and the 134th Air Refueling Group, of Knoxville. Both units participated in the initial air strikes of Operation Desert Storm. Members of the 134th Air Refueling Group, of Knoxville, were involved in refueling allied aircraft involved in air attacks on Iraq and Kuwait, while some 100 members of the 164th Mobile Aerial Port Squadron prepared planes and handled flight lines as planes departed bases enroute to their targets. In past wars, Tennesseans have distinguished themselves in the service of their country and initial reports concerning the performance of the 134th and 164th indicate that this war will be no exception. We are all proud of them and pray for their safety.

I am encouraged by the initial reports which suggest that the operation has been strategically successful and that there has been a minimal loss of life. Throughout this crisis I have warned against the potential consequences of involving ourselves in a ground war. If one were asked to describe a successful scenario it would have to include the accomplishment of the goals as stated in the United Nations resolutions while incurring the least amount of human loss. In order to achieve success we must maintain control of the air. Each additional minute that we control the air guarantees the safety of those soldiers on the ground. I commend the action of the President thus far and urge him to stay the course and not commit ground forces until absolutely necessary.

In addition, I would like to compliment the remarkable coordination which was demonstrated by the multinational forces. This is the largest aerial assault ever launched against a single nation. An attack of this magnitude requires an extraordinary amount of cooperation, a cooperation which has been continuously demonstrated by this unprecedented coalition.

I compliment the leadership's initiative to bring this resolution forward and I urge my colleagues to support Senate Concurrent Resolution 2. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. APPELGATE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support, strong support, of Senate Concurrent Resolution 2.

Mr. Speaker, less than 1 week ago we in the Congress debated at length over the issue

of granting President Bush the powers to take all necessary actions against Saddam Hussein and Iraq if negotiations did not succeed. While the arguments in this Chamber were diverse and often opposing, there can be no doubt today that we must all stand firmly resolved in the face of Saddam Hussein's tyranny and that we need to be strongly united as Americans behind the men and women of our Armed Forces.

We, as Americans, and all free people throughout the world, owe a tremendous amount of gratitude to our service men and women in the Persian Gulf and to our many allies who have joined with us in the just cause to confront Saddam Hussein and Iraq. We must now stand behind President Bush and our Armed Forces in their attempts to carry out the edicts of the U.N. resolutions calling for the restoration of freedom and a legitimate government to Kuwait and calling for the necessary means to achieve these goals.

The Congress has spoken on behalf of the American people and, regardless of how we may have voted last Saturday, it is essential that all Members of the House and the Senate and that all Americans stand firmly behind our brave and courageous fellow Americans who are engaged in battle in the Middle East. If there's one thing we don't need in our country today it's divisiveness.

Let us pray that this conflict will be resolved as soon as possible, but let us not agree to offering up mounting casualties in our attempts to defeat Saddam Hussein and to liberate Kuwait. We need to maintain our vigilance during this very serious time and to focus on a future when victory will finally be won. We pray that there will be very minimal casualties and loss of life of Americans and our allies, and of all innocent people who have been drawn into this conflict due to Saddam Hussein's grab for power. We must stand strong and united.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to explain my boycott of today's resolution.

Last week, Members of Congress were called to Washington to vote on a measure authorizing the President to use all means necessary, including force, to remove Iraq from Kuwait. I voted in support of this resolution, once again confirming my strong support for the President and for our brave men and women who are putting their lives on the line in the name of peace.

Since Iraq's invasion of Kuwait, I have clearly stated my support for the masterful way in which President Bush has handled the gulf crisis, including the building of an international coalition comprised of 28 nations, in support of the belief that the aggression of Saddam Hussein must be stopped.

Since early August, economic sanctions have been in effect and all diplomatic avenues tried. Although I had hoped a peaceful resolution would be reached, I voted to give the President authority to use force if necessary to remove Iraq from Kuwait, convinced that the United Nations had exhausted all diplomatic avenues.

In supporting last week's resolution, I not only voted in support of the President and his policies, but for our troops and for world peace. Most in the majority voted against the measure.

Now, after hearing encouraging reports from the White House and the Pentagon about our offensive military actions thus far in the gulf war, those Members in the majority want to jump on the bandwagon in support of Operation Desert Storm. They want to save their backsides because they failed to support the President last week when their vote was really needed. Now, they are calling Members back to Washington for a mere couple hours of debate and vote on a new resolution. Sorry, too late in my book.

It's appalling for the leadership to call Congress back into session for nothing but a public relations gimmick for those who voted against last week's resolution. It is a gross waste of time, effort, and taxpayers' dollars to transport Members back to the Nation's Capital so that those who failed to commit their support last week, can do so now.

Frankly, I think it is more important for me to be in Colorado, explaining to the people of the Fifth District about U.S. involvement and ongoing developments in the gulf. I think the procedure to call us all back for an hour of debate in front of the TV cameras is a sham. Politicizing and trivializing on the fact that our sons and daughters, mothers and fathers, brothers, sisters, and friends are risking their lives for world peace is an abhorrence. It simply confirms the disgust and distrust the American people have for Congress.

Today, more than ever, I stand firmly behind the President and the international coalition on enforcing the U.N. resolutions. My support for our efforts to resolve the conflict in the gulf has never wavered. I will continue to watch the developments closely and look forward to the rapid resolution of the conflict and the speedy return home of our troops.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, 2 days ago, President Bush made the difficult decision to begin a military operation to contain Saddam Hussein and force him out of Kuwait. In the days preceding the onset of hostilities, it was my fervent hope that this crisis would be resolved peacefully, but Saddam ensured that this would not be the case.

President Bush's August 1990, response to Iraq's aggression was a prudent reaction to a dangerous and potentially deadly situation. He led an international coalition working toward a peaceful diplomatic solution to the crisis by stating unequivocally that Saddam's naked aggression would not be tolerated, deploying United States troops to Saudi Arabia, coordinating a multinational military force in the region, establishing a worldwide economic blockade, and urging the adoption of U.N. resolutions condemning Iraq's actions.

When Congress voted on this grave matter last week, the President could demonstrate that the world was serious about enforcing U.N. resolutions demanding an Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait. This was one last attempt to convince Saddam to leave peacefully. The binding legislation passed by Congress did not call for a fight, but it was the final chance to resolve the crisis without war.

For 5 months, Saddam Hussein miscalculated the strength of the international community's resolve and chose to pursue his own course of action, despite furious diplomatic efforts to end the crisis. His intransigence has forced the President's hand. Now that Presi-

dent Bush has initiated military action to contain Saddam and restore the sovereignty of Kuwait, we must come together to support our men and women in the Persian Gulf.

All Americans should be proud of our dedicated men and women serving in the Persian Gulf. Their efforts will ensure that a dangerous dictator is contained and the rights of a sovereign nation are protected. In the long run, our brave soldiers, sailors, flyers, and marines will help establish a new world order in which relations between nations are based on trust and diplomacy rather than violence and intimidation. Let us pray for their safety and for a swift conclusion to the hostilities.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in full support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, a measure commending the President and our troops in the Persian Gulf.

The last 2 days have brought a Tom Clancy novel to life. The dispatches from the Middle East have kept the world tuned to media sources in a fashion not seen since World War II. We pray for an end to the hostilities and for the preservation of peace.

Last Saturday's vote was the most emotional action I have taken in my 10 years in the Congress. While we hoped for a diplomatic solution to the situation, we all knew the magnitude of our vote. Now that hostilities have broken out, we must unequivocally stand behind the Commander in Chief and our deployed forces. Our troops in the Middle East are a cross section of America's best and brightest young people. They look to the Congress and the United States for guidance and support. We must not turn our backs on these men and women. They must know that the Congress will support their mission during times of triumph and setback.

As members of the world's greatest deliberative body, we are responsible for much of the decisionmaking process that involves our Armed Forces. We can make no greater statement today than to pass a resolution that reflects support for the mission they are now designated to carry out. I urge my colleagues to cast yet another important vote, a vote of unparalleled support for members of the Armed Forces of the United States in the Persian Gulf.

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of this resolution and the Americans it supports in this time of peril.

I feel a great sense of pride and admiration for our men and women in the armed services. There is no doubt that when called upon, and when given the strategic and material support necessary, American soldiers are equal to any task. That is comforting to know.

What a blessed nation we are to have courageous and patriotic citizens who serve in this time of an all volunteer military. Let this put to rest any suspicion that the members of this generation are less willing to serve or are less enthusiastic about the American way of life than those who came before them. Their performance here and their sense of duty and honor in this service is a beacon of hope for our Nation. We are justifiably proud.

And let me say a word for our reservists, including those from the 1244th Transportation Company in my district in southern Illinois, who have played vital roles in the readiness which made the early days of this conflict so

successful. Called to duty away from their families for long periods of time and facing unknown dangers, these reservists have proudly surpassed our expectations.

I want every family in southern Illinois who has a son or daughter, mother or father, husband or wife, friend or relative in Operation Desert Storm to know how thankful we are for their service to our area and our country in this time of trial. Their efforts are awe inspiring and humbling.

Of course the same is true for the men and women who are not from our districts but are just as important because they are Americans. Whether they're from the towns and farms of my district or the big cities far away, they represent the variety of backgrounds, races, and ethnic groups that make up these United States, and we love them all.

Even though I did not agree with the policy sought by the President, I, like so many of my colleagues have concluded that Congress took its obligation to debate, laid out the case for the American people, and now must support the administration in its efforts. My prayers are with President George Bush, who is performing as Commander in Chief with dignity and purpose.

I wish to express my sympathy for the loss of life wherever it has occurred, in the civilian populations where the fighting is taking place, for the American servicemen we know have been lost, and for those we will learn about in the hours and days to come.

We are here today with the boost of initial victory in our step and the resolve to end this war as quickly as possible in our hearts. We face an uncertain future, both in the near term for this conflict, and in the long term for what will transpire once our forces are successful in their mission. May we commit ourselves, just as we are committed to our forces in the Persian Gulf, to search for the answers to tyranny, hatred, and animosity and to work for real peace. The greatest and most lasting legacy of our brave men and women today would be to have answered the call that took the world away from terrible violence and toward an era of understanding and peaceful solutions to the hostilities that plague this world.

We pray for their safety, and pray for peace.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that I opposed the resolution authorizing the use of force in the Persian Gulf. I was, and remain, convinced that economic and diplomatic pressure could have forced Saddam Hussein from Kuwait without resorting to war.

Nonetheless, this does not in any reflect a lack of respect, concern, or support for our troops in the field. These men and women are carrying out a mission ordered by the President and duly authorized by Congress, and they are doing so with great professionalism and courage.

Therefore, I support this resolution to commend the troops who have been put in harm's way by the current policy. They deserve our full support.

I would also like to express my outrage at the attack last evening by Iraq against innocent civilians in Israel. Although Israel is not a member of the anti-Iraq coalition and is a non-combatant state in the gulf conflict, Saddam Hussein launched an unprovoked attack against Israeli civilians. This despicable act

deserves the strongest possible condemnation by the United States and the entire international community.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I wish to express the fervent hope that this tragic conflict can be brought to a speedy end with as few casualties as possible.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, today's resolution on the Persian Gulf will help to send another message to the Middle East.

Saddam Hussein, if he has time to watch the news between the bombs that are falling around him, should know that Americans are united in their support of our troops and our action.

Our men and women, who are so bravely and professionally carrying out their duties in the Persian Gulf region, will know how proud all Americans are of them and how committed we are to their success and their safety.

As events of the last 40 hours have so amply demonstrated, we are not in this alone. Aircraft of several other nations have been engaged and a total of 28 nations are committed to help implement the U.N. resolution.

But international support and commitment is not enough. The strongest voices must be our own. I remember vividly my own experience as a Vietnam veteran, reading the accounts of protests in the United States, seeing them on the television screen. There is no doubt in my mind that these events affected the morale, the attitude of our men in Vietnam.

I support the right of Americans to protest peacefully against actions taken by their government. Our right to dissent is one of the values we cherish. And I will never stand by while that right is taken away from Americans.

But, Mr. Speaker, this conflict is different from Vietnam. Then it could be argued with some truth that we slid into that war, that Congress never exercised its constitutional responsibility to commit American Forces to military action.

No one can say that about this conflict. Last Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, this Congress engaged in one of the longest, most intense and emotional debates in modern history. But there was no mistaking the meaning of our vote. All of us, whether we voted for or against the resolution giving the President the authority to use force to enforce the U.N. mandates, we knew that it amounted to a declaration of war.

Many of the phone calls and letters that I received before that vote were demands that Congress fulfill its constitutional responsibility. And I agreed with that sentiment. And Congress did debate the issue. And we voted. We voted to give the President the authority to commit troops to action in the Mideast.

There are many who still believe Congress made the wrong decision. Do they also believe in constitutional processes? Do they believe in the right of the American people to express their will through their elected representatives? If the answer to those questions is "yes," then those who protest this war in the streets of America today are wrong. Dead wrong.

They still have the right to protest. We will not deny that right. To do so only diminishes our own rights. But their protests should be limited to changing the minds of their elected officials or changing the elected officials them-

selves. They do not serve their cause or the American soldier by giving a false picture to the world, by suggesting to Saddam Hussein that Americans do not support our men and women who are fighting in the Middle East.

Because they do. Overwhelmingly, Americans stand behind our soldiers, our sailors, our airmen. Whatever our view was last week, we are now united as one. Let this vote today send that message around the world to all who may doubt.

Our fervent hope, our solemn prayer is that this war will be over quickly, that our men and women will return home to their families safely. Let no one mistake these isolated protests as a lack of resolve on our part to end the tyranny of Saddam Hussein.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, on January 16, our country made the fateful decision to take military action in the gulf. I did not agree with that decision because I did not feel that every other means of forcing Iraq out of Kuwait had yet been exhausted. Everyday I regret the incredible suffering that this war—like all wars—brings. But the Congress has already debated the issue last week, and it voted to give the President authority to take this fateful step.

Since that time, many of us have made statements to our constituents that we stand behind our troops, that we support their courage and their sacrifice, and that we will provide all they need to do the job they have bravely taken on. But today, we come together to repeat this message as one body.

In passing this resolution, Congress is telling our servicemen and women in the gulf that we honor and respect them. We are telling them that when, God willing, they return home safely to their families, they will return as deserving of praise for their courage. With all the burdens weighing on their minds at this time, let them not worry about that.

Meanwhile, back here at home, I hope that we will continue to respect the differing opinions that exist. I hope that as we applaud the courage of our troops, none of us question the patriotism of those here at home who opposed the war during the recent national debate.

This war will be painful. The euphoria some have expressed is premature. It will require sacrifices and suffering from many quarters. I want at this time to recognize the special burden that falls on Israel in this tragic conflict. Yesterday, Iraq attacked Israel with Scud missiles. These missiles landed in civilian areas of Tel Aviv and Haifa for one reason: to draw Israel into the conflict. Deciding, as Israel did, to ride out a first strike, and not attack preemptively, was an extremely difficult decision. We must assume that Israel had accurate intelligence about where these Scud launchers were and, therefore, had the ability to address the bulk of this threat preemptively. But they did not, respecting President Bush's concern that the international coalition that the United States has worked to construct would come unraveled.

Now they have taken a second step that further demonstrates their restraint. They have not retaliated. How many countries, having come under direct attack with no provocation on their part, would show such restraint?

I am outraged at the Scud attack on population centers in Israel. Almost every country in the region is a member of the international

military coalition arrayed against Iraq—but not Israel. Yet Israel is attacked. Worse of all Iraq fired its deadly missiles against purely civilian areas.

I fervently hope that further attacks on Israel will not follow. But I know, and Israel knows, that they might. If we ever had any doubts about the nature of Saddam Hussein, we have none now. He brutally invaded Kuwait, a small country that presented no threat whatsoever to Iraq. He has now attacked Israel when Israel has practiced restraint and not participated in the international military coalition.

We all hope that this war will end quickly, that our American service men and women will come home safely, that we will do all in our power to limit casualties among innocent civilians in all countries, and that we, as a country, will respect each other in our differing views.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, we are in session today, in the wake of congressional action to authorize the United States to use military force in the gulf situation, in accordance with the decision by the allied nations, to consider a resolution that expresses our support, and that I pray of a grateful nation, for our brave troops who are doing an outstanding job in the Persian Gulf.

Never have I been so awe-struck as I have been by those brave, and amazingly able young men and women who are now into their third day of the battle to liberate Kuwait from the clutches of Saddam Hussein.

My vote in favor of the resolution authorizing the President to take whatever action necessary, after all avenues toward a peaceful resolution of the crisis had failed to drive Iraq's Army from Kuwait, was the most difficult one I have made in my 14 years in the House.

None of us wanted war. None of us wanted any loss of innocent American lives, or the innocent lives of our allied nations' troops because it became necessary to send the terrible guns of war into the gulf region. Yet I cannot express—there are not sufficient words in the English language to adequately express—my sense of absolute awe of the magnificent job our troops, and those of our allied countries, in making their decisive strike against Iraq. Their success, their effectiveness, which has been described as "precise and surgical"—can also be described as absolutely brilliant.

In the words of Gen. Norman Schwarzkopf, they are truly the thunder and lightning of Operation Desert Storm.

I applaud the outstanding training that our armed services personnel have received, in the hands of their strategic planners, their instructors, that has enabled them to carry out their mission, with skill, precision, guts, and zealotness. It is this kind of training that will help keep them safe, and surely spare many casualties in battle.

Speaking of Operation Desert Storm, and the outstanding performance of both our troops, those of our allies, and the sheer excellence of the sophisticated equipment and technology available to them, I must reiterate here, in the strongest terms possible, that we must have more of a commitment from those allies on burden-sharing.

The costs of the Persian Gulf crisis, now that we are engaged in conflict, are expected

to rise by as much as 58 percent, according to the Congressional Budget Office. We have to have financial support in greater amounts than those already pledged, but not yet paid, as well as additional pledges of support as we go along.

We do not know—we hope it isn't very long—but we do not know how long this war will last. The costs could be more than even our financially strapped taxpayers should reasonably be expected to underwrite. This is true especially in view of spending caps placed on our budget process last year. Whether we keep Desert Storm off budget or not, money is money and there is only one source of those funds—the taxpayers of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I have a sense-of-the-Congress resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 23, I have introduced, calling upon our allies to pay their fair share, and for the President of the United States to pursue commitments from those allies to increase their contributions to the gulf war costs.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in bringing this resolution to the floor of the House, and to vote to pass it, in order to assure that our outstanding troops can, without fail, continue to be resupplied with the arms and equipment they need to sustain them in the war against Iraq, and the liberation of Kuwait.

Mr. Speaker, I was able to talk to several West Virginia soldiers from my home district, who are assigned to Saudi Arabia, but who had returned home for a few days emergency leave before returning there.

Those soldiers begged me to allow them to do their duty as they saw it. They did not want to be left sitting any longer in the desert sands of Saudi Arabia, with nothing to do. They wanted, in their own words, "to go in, get the job done, get out, and come home—period."

I reiterate my sense of awe regarding the tremendous performance of our troops, and those of our allies. I believe they have so far been successful beyond our wildest dreams, for even we didn't realize just how very well-trained, how very ready, and how very able, our Armed Forces were. And I believe they will continue to be successful in the completion of their mission to liberate Kuwait, so that perhaps never again will one nation seek to overcome, to prevail over their neighbors, through the use of force and violence.

That is why we are there, and when we leave the Middle East in victory, I hope that we as a country can proceed to the next step of diplomacy, resolving other problems in that region that affect both Israel and the Arab world, so that this hard-won peace will prevail.

It was Thomas Jefferson who said, when this Nation was in its infancy, "Peace is our Passion." Peace is still our passion in the United States, and it will remain so through the very efforts to obtain peace that are being carried out in the gulf region today.

I hope this war is over with quickly. We have been told it will not, cannot become another Vietnam—to go on and on without cease, and without success. In the words of the West Virginia soldiers who spoke their hearts to me: "Let them go in, get the job done, get out, and come home."

And finally, Mr. Speaker, when these young men and women do come home, veterans of this war, let them be greeted with a hero's welcome. Let them feel the pride they are entitled to, make them feel no shame as Vietnam's veterans were made to feel shame. Let whatever their needs might be upon their return, and that of their families, be met willingly by a grateful nation. Let their needs never be challenged or neglected as they were for Vietnam's veterans.

And finally, I convey to every single man and woman, regardless of their country's origin, now fighting in the gulf region, my thanks for the defense of me, my family, my country, and my prayers for their safety and their sure return to their homes and families as quickly as possible.

Mr. LOWERY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my unequivocal support for the President's decision to begin Operation Desert Storm to secure the liberation of Kuwait and end Iraq's aggression toward its neighbors. In addition, I, like all Americans, am thankful for the courage and commitment of the men and women now carrying out this vital mission. The President, the Congress, and the Nation will give our troops every means of support to complete their task and return home safely. We can begin to express our support by passing the resolution before us today.

We are now at war with Iraq. We must strive to defeat its military quickly and completely, with minimum losses for our forces and among Iraqi civilians. We take no satisfaction in armed conflict, but Saddam Hussein has forced the hand of the civilized world and his brutal aggression will be stopped.

Iraq's unjustified invasion and occupation of Kuwait; its inhumane treatment of Kuwaiti citizens; and, its missile attacks on civilian targets in Israel graphically illustrate the danger to the world presented by Saddam Hussein's regime. He does not seek peace, he seeks to bring all the nations of the region under his violent control. The United States and the international coalition will not permit this to happen. Our goal is to end Hussein's reign of terror and to allow issues in the Middle East to be resolved peacefully.

Mr. Speaker, the initiation of Operation Desert Storm brings out a variety of emotions in us. We are very pleased by the early results of the air campaign against Iraqi military targets. The precise and effective execution of the battle plan by our service personnel is a tribute to them and a source of pride to us. At the same time, we feel a sense of apprehension and sadness at the prospect of casualties among our pilots and airmen. We have experienced only a few casualties and our operations are highly successful. Our deep thanks and prayers go to the servicemen who have sacrificed themselves for our Nation and to their families. Their efforts are a vital part of a victory over Iraq, the liberation of Kuwait and a halt to this aggression in the Middle East.

I want to pay special tribute to the over 55,000 Marines and Navy personnel from the San Diego area now participating in Operation Desert Storm. One out of eight service men or women now in the Middle East is from San Diego. Their dedication to their dangerous task and the support they receive from family and friends in San Diego are an inspiration to

me and all Americans. I pledge my support to the troops in Operation Desert Storm and to the President in his effort to bring this conflict to a just and rapid conclusion. I ask all my colleagues in Congress to do the same.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Speaker, today we vote on a resolution of support for the President and our troops in the gulf. In my judgment, we could have—and should have—cast this vote last Saturday immediately following the vote on the war resolution.

I was not prepared to vote for war prior to the January 15 deadline. However, in keeping with its constitutional obligation by a majority vote Congress committed the Nation to war on January 12. A thorough debate had ended. A decision had been made. I believed at the time, it was important to unite the country behind that decision. In my view, when we go to war—we must go as a nation in full support of the effort. That's the best way to support our troops and to assure success.

It is my hope that our vote today might help to further galvanize public support for the brave men and women in the gulf and the mission for which we have asked them to risk their lives.

Mr. KOPETSKI. Mr. Speaker, I support Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, a resolution expressing the support of the Congress for U.S. troops in the Persian Gulf.

Although there are many of us who disagreed with the decision to use force immediately after the U.N. deadline, we have been united always in our gratitude to and admiration for the men and women who serve in the Armed Forces.

The men and women of the U.S. military are unequaled in their bravery and dedication to their country. They deserve the full support of the Congress and the American public. They give their best and we should give our best—our best judgment, effort, and resources—to ensure their safe return home.

I am particularly proud that many residents of Oregon's Fifth Congressional District are serving their Nation in these difficult times. My heart goes out to them and their families. I pray for their safety and a swift end to this war.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURTHA). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2).

The question was taken.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 399, nays 6, answered "present" 6, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 10]
YEAS—399

Abercrombie Early
Ackerman Eckart
Alexander Edwards (CA)
Allard Edwards (OK)
Anderson Edwards (TX)
Andrews (ME) Emerson
Andrews (NJ) Engel
Andrews (TX) English
Annunzio Erdreich
Anthony Espy
Archer Evans
Arney Fawell
Aspin Fazio
Atkins Feighan
AuCoin Fields
Bacchus Flake
Baker Foglietta
Ballenger Foley
Barnard Ford (MI)
Barrett Frank (MA)
Bartlett Frank (CT)
Barton Frost
Bateman Gallegly
Beilenson Gallo
Bennett Gaydos
Bentley Gejdenson
Bereuter Gekas
Berman Gekas
Bevill Gephardt
Billbray Geren
Billakis Gibbons
Bliley Gilchrist
Boehlert Gillmor
Boehner Gilman
Bonior Gingrich
Borski Glickman
Boucher Goodling
Boxer Gordon
Brewster Goss
Brooks Gradison
Broomfield Grandy
Browder Gray
Brown Green
Bruce Guarini
Bryant Gunderson
Bunning Hall (OH)
Bustamante Hall (TX)
Byron Hamilton
Callahan Hammerschmidt
Camp Hancock
Campbell (CA) Hansen
Campbell (CO) Harris
Cardin Hastert
Carper Hatcher
Carr Hayes (LA)
Chandler Hefner
Chapman Henry
Clinger Herger
Coleman (MO) Hertel
Coleman (TX) Hoagland
Collins (MI) Hobson
Combust Hochbrueckner
Condit Holloway
Conte Hopkins
Conyers Horn
Cooper Horton
Costello Houghton
Coughlin Hoyer
Cox (CA) Hubbard
Cox (IL) Huckaby
Coyne Hughes
Cramer Hunter
Cunningham Hutto
Dannemeyer Hyde
Darden Inhofe
DeFazio Ireland
de la Garza James
DeLauro Jefferson
DeLay Jenkins
Derrick Johnson (CT)
Dickinson Johnson (SD)
Dicks Johnston
Dingell Jones (GA)
Donnelly Jones (NC)
Dooley Jontz
Doolittle Kanjorski
Dorgan (ND) Kaptur
Dornan (CA) Kasich
Downey Kennedy
Dreier Kennelly
Duncan Kildee
Durbine Kleczka
Dwyer Klug

Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Porter
Poshard
Price
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Ravenel
Ray
Reed
Regula
Rhodes
Richardson
Ridge
Riggs
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Roe
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Santorum
Santorum
Sarpaluis
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Scheuer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schulze
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skeltton
Slattery
Slaughter (NY)
Slaughter (VA)
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Solarz
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Staggers
Stallings
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stump
Swett
Swift
Synar

Tallon
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (GA)
Thomas (WY)
Thornton
Torres
Torricelli
Traffant
Traxler
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Waxman
Weber
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wyden
Wyllie
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zelliff
Zimmer

NAYS—6

Dymally Sanders
Hayes (IL) Savage Washington
Waters

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—6

Collins (IL) Gonzalez
Dellums Owens (NY) Payne (NJ)
Towns

NOT VOTING—24

Applegate Fish
Burton Ford (TN)
Clay Hefley
Clement Jacobs
Coble Levine (CA)
Crane Marlenee
Davis Martinez
Dixon Morrison

□ 1622

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Clement and Mr. Dixon for, Mr. Clay against.

Messrs. ARMEY, HUNTER, and AL-LARD changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on Senate Concurrent Resolution 2.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. MURTHA). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, due to difficult travel conditions abroad which accompanied the outbreak of the war, I was unable to reach Washington in time for the vote on the Persian Gulf resolution, I would like to take this opportunity to report that had I been present, I would have voted nay on Senate Concurrent Resolution, 2 supporting the U.S. presence in the Persian Gulf.

I have devoted my life to encouraging the peaceful resolution of conflict. Unlike most of my colleagues, I believe the situation in Iraq and Kuwait should have been the subject of more diplomatic negotiations. I am gravely distressed by the President's decision to bomb Iraq and I am praying for an end to this war.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to address the House for one minute.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time that I might inquire of the distinguished majority leader the program for next week.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I am happy to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Let me first inform Members that on tomorrow, Saturday, at 1:30, and on Monday at 1:30, and on Tuesday at 1:30, now that time may change, but that is the tentative time and Members may go through the Cloakrooms to get definite times, there will be briefings in the room of the Armed Services Committee, which is 2118 Rayburn, on the war in the gulf, so Members are all invited to those briefings.

On Monday of next week the House will not be in session, however, because of the recognition of the birthday of Martin Luther King, Jr.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon to consider two suspensions:

H.R. 3, Increasing the Rates of Disability Compensation for Veterans, and House concurrent resolution condemning the recent violence by Soviet forces in Lithuania. Votes on both those suspensions will not be held on Tuesday, but will be held on Wednesday, and also on Wednesday the House will meet at noon to take up two suspensions; first, a House concurrent resolution condemning the Iraqi attack on Israel. I know a number of Members are anxious for that resolution to come up. I know that all of us have disparaged the outrageous attack on Israel and want to commend the Israelis for their willingness to forego at least for the time being retaliatory action.

Then there will be H.R. 4, extending the IRS deadline for Desert Storm troops, and recorded votes on suspen-

sions postponed from Tuesday, January 22, so all the votes will be on Wednesday.

There will be organizational matters relating to the convening of the 1st session of the 102d Congress, resolutions providing for the election of Members to committees of the House.

Then on Thursday, January 24, and Friday, January 25, the House will meet in pro forma session at 11 a.m. The schedule will be announced, but we do not expect rollcall votes on Thursday or Friday.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished leader.

MAKING IN ORDER ON WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 23, 1991, MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order to consider on Wednesday, January 23, 1991, a motion to suspend the rules and pass a bill extending the Internal Revenue Service filing deadlines for Desert Shield troops, and a motion to suspend the rules and agree to a concurrent resolution condemning the Iraqi attack on Israel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SPRATT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

ENERGY SECURITY—THE SECOND FRONT THE NATIONAL ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 1991

(Mr. PANETTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, we have obviously opened up a war front in the Persian Gulf, but the time has also come within this country to open up a second front with regard to energy policy. For that reason I am introducing today the National Energy Policy Act of 1991. It is a comprehensive bill relating to energy that promotes alternative fuel development and energy conservation and will help to develop a stable supply of energy for this country.

Mr. Speaker, we know that one of the primary causes behind this war was our dependence on oil in the Middle East.

Ten years ago we knew that we were vulnerable to this kind of blackmail, and yet, after 10 years, we find ourselves being held hostage by our oil dependency.

It is absolutely essential that we understand that one of our goals in the Persian Gulf crisis must be now to establish a comprehensive energy policy for this country. It is thousands of bombs and missiles too late for an energy policy to resolve this conflict, but it is not too late for the future, and perhaps the best victory we can give men and women who are in the Persian Gulf is a return home to a country that has developed an energy policy that assures energy security for the future.

How many times do we have to learn this lesson? This is not the first time that our failure to develop a rational national energy policy has threatened our national security during a political upheaval in the Middle East. Regrettably, we have failed to recognize the dangers of our dependency on cheap Middle East oil and take steps to secure America's national energy security. It is now thousands of bombs and missiles too late for an energy policy to resolve this conflict. But it is not too late for the future. If the United States can bring to bear just a fraction of the funds and commitment given to military security, we can successfully develop a responsible national policy to give us energy security in the future.

If Congress acts to adopt the National Energy Policy Act of 1991, it will declare its willingness to confront this domestic vulnerability of oil dependence that keeps threatening our security. This comprehensive legislation would assure America's energy future over the short and long terms by taking immediate steps to make us significantly less vulnerable to energy supply disruptions, and by investing resources to promote the use of energy conservation and alternative fuels to curb our dependence on oil over the long term.

A full examination of our national energy needs and resources, taking into account our national concern for a cleaner environment, was conducted for the development of this bill. The result of this effort is legislation that will be effective not only toward improving our Nation's energy security, but also in developing a balanced stewardship of our resources for the future.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to briefly describe the major components of the National Energy Policy Act:

SECURING AMERICA'S ENERGY FUTURE

STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE

The bill would seek to protect our economy from the effects of an oil supply disruption by dramatically increasing the strategic petroleum reserve [SPR] from its current level of approximately 590 million barrels to an eventual level of 2 billion barrels. With such

a reserve the United States would be more than prepared to ride out a significant oil supply disruption for many months. Given the limited percentage of world oil resources contained in the United States, a large reserve is perhaps the strongest line of defense against a potentially crippling future oil disruption.

FLOOR PRICE FOR OIL

The world oil market is highly volatile by its very nature. It is particularly unstable and prone to large-scale disruptions because so much of the world's least expensive oil lies in a highly unstable part of the world. To help stabilize U.S. energy consumption and production, the legislation would enact a floor price for oil of \$16 a barrel.

The purpose of this floor price is two fold: First, to give consumers the signal to continue conserving energy, and second, to give domestic producers the assurance that a future decline in oil prices will not wipe out their investments. The floor price would be triggered whenever imported oil prices fell below \$16 a barrel. The bill would exempt from the tax all oil produced from onshore wells, except for those on State and Federal competitively leased lands.

WESTERN HEMISPHERE ENERGY COOPERATION

The legislation would also help diversify the world oil supply through the promotion of Western Hemisphere energy cooperation by the U.S. Government. The bill would require the President to prepare a report to Congress on Western Hemisphere energy cooperation. This report would discuss options for United States cooperation with countries such as Mexico, Venezuela, and Canada that would lead to higher oil production capability in these countries. The bill would also permit the President to exempt from the tax oil exports from Mexico, Venezuela, and Canada as a means of furthering Western Hemisphere energy cooperation.

PROMOTING ALTERNATIVE SOURCES OF ENERGY

ALTERNATIVE FUEL VEHICLES

Concerns over our dependency on imported oil, coupled with our national concern for a cleaner environment, compel the United States to increase its use of clean-burning alternate fuel vehicles. Unfortunately, gains in this area of energy development have been hampered by problems in the transportation infrastructure.

To address this problem, the bill would provide funding on a cost-sharing basis to State and local entities to invest in alternative fuel vehicles for vehicle fleets and mass transportation. The bill also would require Federal agencies to consider alternate fuel vehicles for Government fleets and require that, at a minimum, 60 percent of Federal vehicle fleets be alternate fuel vehicles by the year 2000.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

In addition, the legislation would strengthen support of alternate energy sources through heightened research and development funding for energy conservation and alternative fuels.

RENEW CONSERVATION GRANTS AND REQUIRE CONSERVATION IN GOVERNMENT

ENERGY CONSERVATION GRANTS

The bill would promote energy efficiency by restoring adequate funding for energy conservation and weatherization grants for States, low-income homes, schools, and hospitals.

FEDERAL ENERGY MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

Furthermore, the legislation would establish a Federal Energy Management Program, to be managed by the Department of Energy, to promote energy conservation throughout the Federal Government.

PROMOTING ENERGY EFFICIENCY

ENHANCE CONSERVATION BY UTILITIES

To support and further the enactment of conservation measures by utilities, the bill would require State utilities to consider enacting energy conservation incentive plans—similar to those implemented recently by the California and New York Commissions—to reduce consumption.

TAX EXCLUSION FOR ENERGY AND WATER CONSERVATION REBATES

Additionally, the bill would exempt payments consumers receive from utilities for energy and water conservation measures from taxation.

REDUCED CONSUMPTION IN TRANSPORTATION SECTOR

MOTOR VEHICLE FUEL EFFICIENCY

As more than half of the oil consumed by this Nation is used in the transportation sector, initiatives to conserve motor fuels must be a cornerstone of our national energy policy. To this end, the National Energy Policy Act would increase the automotive fleet mileage efficiency targets required by the corporate average fuel economy [CAFE] law 20 percent by 1996 and 40 percent by the year 2001.

STAND-BY GASOLINE TAX

In an effort to continue to encourage the conservation of motor fuels, the legislation would also establish a contingency standby gasoline tax which would be implemented when crude oil prices drop by one-half the price of the drop. The tax will only go into effect when there is a drop in oil prices below the average price of oil at enactment. Thus, the tax will only grow when crude oil prices fall sufficiently and then by no more than one-half of the price decline.

It has recently been noted in news reports that, as an indirect result of the crisis in the Persian Gulf, many oil companies in the United States have experienced a significant increase in profits during the last quarter. This realization has prompted many in Congress to look toward the possible re-

newal of a windfall profit tax on the oil industry. While I have not included such a tax in this legislation, Mr. Speaker, I want to assure my colleagues that I will continue to closely monitor this situation to ascertain if such a provision would be appropriately suited for helping to meet the costs of the energy policy initiatives contained in this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the degree to which we have risked our national security, economy, and the lives of hundreds of thousands of American troops in the Persian Gulf obligates the Congress to treat energy as a national security interest equal in importance to military capabilities.

We owe it to the American men and women defending our interests in the Persian Gulf to ardently pursue this second front to achieve a secure energy future. I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort by supporting the National Energy Policy Act of 1991.

The Washington Post included in its publication this morning an editorial on the urgent need for a national energy strategy. I believe this editorial raises many important points and would like to bring it to my colleagues' attention. A copy of the editorial, as well as a summary bill follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 18, 1991]

NEEDED: AN ENERGY STRATEGY

The administration now enters its third year without a serious national energy policy. The war in the Mideast, having to do in part with oil, only underscores the lack. National energy demand is not among the things the administration has shown itself willing to attack.

World supplies of oil and gas may be larger than currently thought; they still are finite, and not enough are in this country. There is, of course, a need to try to increase domestic production as well as to shift to alternative fuels. But there remains also a need to conserve, for the sake of the environment as well as the economy and national security.

There are two ways to induce conservation of oil and its byproducts: raise the price or regulate the use. The first is the more efficient, but both should probably be tried; the problem is that serious. Transportation is the likeliest, though not only, place to look for savings. The auto is the source of waste.

The budget agreement between the president and Congress last fall included a nickel-a-gallon increase in the gasoline tax. That was a small step in the right direction. There should be further increases once the recession is over. They would strengthen the government's finances, finance other needed government programs and at the same time deter consumption. The regressive effects could be otherwise offset. No other energy tax would accomplish as much as simply. The companion proposals that have been made to require better auto mileage would help as well.

The administration has resisted such steps on philosophical grounds—the view that markets are wiser than governments—as well as for the obvious political reasons. It has not wanted to impose the burden. The Energy Department has been at work on a national policy statement for a year and a half. The work continues in part because of internal disputes on the question of curtail-

ing demand, and it remains unclear what legislative form it may finally take, or when. Leaders of both parties in Congress have acknowledged the need for a balanced energy policy, but Congress will not produce such a policy on its own. Little will happen until an administration leads the way.

NATIONAL ENERGY POLICY ACT [NEP]

SUMMARY

(1) Strategic Petroleum Reserve: The bill would authorize the development and fill of a 2 billion barrel SPRO, with the fill above one billion barrels being dependent on the availability of "leased oil," or revenues from the taxes below. We now have 590 million barrels and the bill strongly encourages that the fill be acquired quickly, as soon as oil markets weaken after the Iraq crisis is over.

(2) Western Hemisphere Energy Cooperation: The bill calls for a report from the President by December 1, 1991, to propose specific ways to cooperate with these countries (particularly Mexico and Venezuela) to develop more oil production capacity in them. It asks for specific recommendations for U.S. assistance, including loans, price guarantees, and political risk insurance for the countries as well as the U.S. private sector.

(3) A \$16 a barrel floor price on domestic on-shore produced oil: Whenever imported oil prices dipped below \$16 a barrel, a variable tax on all oil to refineries and imported products, would be triggered with an exemption for domestic on-shore production. The bill would not give floor price protection to OCS produced oil or oil produced from Federal or State lands that will be competitively leased after enactment. The President could exempt up to 100% of a baseline period's oil imports from Western Hemisphere countries such as Canada, Mexico and Venezuela to help promote Western Hemisphere Energy Cooperation.

(4) Alternative Fuel Vehicles: DOE would be given \$75 million in fiscal year 1992, rising to \$150 million by fiscal year 1995, to help State and municipal agencies, mass transit agencies, and private sector vehicle fleets, buy new vehicles with alternative fuel capability (compressed natural gas, methanol, electricity or other). The Federal Government would be required to purchase an increasing percentage of its vehicle fleets (10% in FY 95 increasing to 60% in FY 2000) as alternative fuel capable vehicles.

(5) Energy R&D Funding: Authorizes an increase of \$171 million (75%) by FY 1994 for energy conservation R&D, an increase of \$200 million (87%) by FY 1996 for solar energy R&D, and FY 1996 increases of \$37 million (82%) in fuel cell R&D and of \$24 million (89%) in enhanced oil recovery R&D.

(6) New Federal Energy Management Plan: Federal agencies would be required to submit energy conservation proposals to DOE, and DOE could make loans to these agencies starting at \$50 million in FY 1992 and rising to \$100 million a year in FY 1993.

(7) Low-Income Weatherization and Schools and Hospitals Conservation Grants: Authorizes a \$200 million weatherization increase by FY 1994, and \$19 million by FY 1993 for schools and hospitals.

(8) An Amendment to PURPA to require all state public utility commissions to consider enacting energy conservation incentive plans similar to those implemented by the New York and California PUC's. If adopted by the PUC's, these would require their utilities to give their customers incentives to conserve energy, and allow the utilities to profit from doing so.

(9) Exempt from taxation payments made by utilities to consumers for energy and water conservation measures.

(10) Standby Contingency Gasoline Conservation Tax: The tax could only go into effect when the price of crude oil in the future fell below the average real price of crude oil during a period before enactment. The tax generally would be set at one-half of that decline in the price of crude oil.

Thus, the tax should start small and grow slowly, and could only grow if and when crude oil prices fell sufficiently, and then, by no more than one-half of the decline. If and when the tax increased, it generally would not raise gasoline prices, rather keep them from falling as much as they otherwise would.

The tax will be set initially at one-tenth of one cent per gallon in FY 1992, and two-tenths of one cent in FY 1993-96 to pay for the tax cuts given to consumers who will receive payments from utilities for adopting energy and water conservation measures.

(11) CAFE auto efficiency targets: This would require a 20 percent improvement in each company's efficiency by 1996, and 40 percent by 2001.

NO PAUSE IN ENFORCING U.N. RESOLUTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Speaker, the suggestion has been offered that at this time, in the third day of the Persian Gulf war, the United States and its allies ought to pause, to allow time, it is said, for negotiations.

The idea is inconceivable. It would show the lack of resolve with which America's foes have long characterized her. Last Saturday, we took our vote. We agreed, in the fullness of debate and in keeping with the Constitution, to authorize the use of force. We knew that, in agreeing to that resolution, we were authorizing the use of force until the objectives set in our joint resolution were achieved. And now, not even a week later, there are calls for us to stop. The voice is heard again, let us give time for diplomacy to work. Can we not stay resolute, even for a week?

It is argued that pausing now would prevent the horrors of bombing. I grant that war is horrible. But in the modern history of mankind of war, never has technology been such as it is now, to allow the use of force to be so targeted to military objectives. America, and her allies, are attacking military targets and military targets alone. Indeed, according to what the Iraqi Government itself has announced, no more than 23 Iraqi lives have been lost in the first 24 hours, a day that saw over 1,300 air sorties—and it is unclear how many, if any of those 23, were civilian.

Contrast this with the Iraq's missile attack on Tel Aviv—an attack directed at population centers, intended to take civilian life. An attack upon a country that has not been involved in the present crisis. An attack that may be

renewed even as we now speak, and that will continue until Saddam Hussein has no more Scud missiles, or planes, or terrorists at his disposal.

Yet voices are heard that we must stop. Stopping will allow Saddam Hussein more time to perfect the means of placing a chemical weapon warhead on top of his mobile Scud missile, to reinforce the defenses with which he has so far preserved the bulk of his air force, to resupply his troops in Kuwait and counter our attempts to induce them, isolate, to lay down their arms without further violence.

We know, now, the intentions of Saddam Hussein. We know he used the 5½ months since his invasion to dig in, to build defenses for his planes and tanks. We know how his minister would not even receive the letter from our President, how he rejected the efforts in the final days of the Secretary General of the United Nations, the Foreign Minister of France, and the Government of Yemen, to withdraw peacefully.

What, in the name of all that is sacred, do we expect he will do now? Come to his senses? Admit he was wrong? Withdraw from Kuwait? Voluntarily disassemble his chemical weapons facilities, voluntarily cease development of a nuclear potential, voluntarily dismantle his Scud missiles?

Any clear minded observer knows he will not. Saddam Hussein has, rather, staked his life on victory. He intends victory. He has buried his planes and tanks so that they can emerge when the bombing is over. He intends to engage the multilateral forces on the ground, in close contact, to neutralize our advantage in the air; hoping that the will of the people of the United States, and of the world, will break.

Even were he to withdraw now from Kuwait, Saddam Hussein would still keep his remaining mobile Scud missiles, and the chemical weapons facilities and stockpiles that have not yet been taken from him. Who can sanely believe he will not use them again?

There is no need to pause for Saddam Hussein to lay down his weapons. He can announce that to the world today, this minute. There is no shortage of news media in the Persian Gulf for him to use.

At another time, when another dictator threatened the world, one who had been allowed too much time, under the cloak of diplomatic negotiation, to build up his army, a champion stood to warn the world. When he was asked what was the policy of his government, he replied, it was to wage war, to wage war with the mighty resolve of which a free people was capable, to wage war until the world be rid of the tyrant's shadow.

Let us show resolve. The decision to use force was easy for none of us. But it has been made. In our country's name, let us now see it through.

□ 1630

THE VIRGIN ISLANDS AND THE PERSIAN GULF WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SPRATT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virgin Islands [Mr. DE LUGO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, our great Nation is now committed to war in the Persian Gulf. At this very moment our brave men and women are risking their lives, engaged in deadly combat against the forces of Iraq.

I have just returned from my home, the Virgin Islands. On the night of January 14, the eve of the United Nations deadline for Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait, I joined hundreds of my neighbors and friends at a prayer service for Virgin Islanders serving in the gulf.

A list of names of those from our community who are serving there was gathered by the members of the congregation, as best they could since no official listing is available. As we listened to a young Virgin Islander read name after name, more than 130 from St. Thomas and St. John alone, the full impact of the war on the people of our community began to strike home. It was sobering to hear the names of our friends and loved ones, those who now face death and whom we pray we will see again. Suddenly, the price of this war and the sacrifice we have been called on to make became very real.

After the list was read, we were invited to add the names of relatives and friends who had been missed. Many more were called out. I, too, added the name of a cousin. Soon, the list from our small community had reached 150.

The following morning when the service was played on a local radio program, listeners were asked to call in names of family or close friends whose names should be included. Telephone lines lit up. Parents called with the names of children. Wives called for husbands. I heard one woman add the names of her three sons and a daughter to the list.

This war in the Persian Gulf is very real to the people of the Virgin Islands. I believe that over 200 Virgin Islanders are serving in Operation Desert Storm at this very moment. They are serving their country proudly and we are proud of them and we support them fully.

So, I say to my colleagues, that last week when this House held its historic debate on the question of war and peace, those Virgin Islanders, their parents, their loved ones, indeed, all citizens, not only of the Virgin Islands but of all the U.S. territories in the Pacific as well as the Caribbean—Guam, American Samoa, the Northern Marianas, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico—had no vote in this Chamber. We had no vote on the most critical decision of all decisions: the decision to commit the lives of our sons and

daughters, that most agonizing of all decisions, the decision of war or peace.

This week there was an editorial in the Washington Post about this situation as it relates to our Nation's capital, the District of Columbia. As I read that editorial I felt great sympathy for the men and women of the District. But I could not help but think that at least they have a choice and a vote in who will lead this country, who will be their Commander in Chief.

Citizens of the U.S. insular areas have neither a vote on the critical issue of war and peace nor a vote in deciding who will be their President and Commander in Chief, to make life and death decisions that will affect their sons and daughters who are called to battle.

This is an unconscionable shame to this democracy, and it is a difficult issue that must be resolved for the honor of this Nation.

AMERICA LOSES AGAIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, each day the debasement of America's industrial might grows worse. We are rapidly selling off the means of industrial production, and our own Government appears to be aiding and abetting in the sale.

Last weekend the Washington Post carried a story about the sale of Moore Special Tool Co., Bridgeport, CT, to a Japanese firm, Fanuc. The article by Kevin Kearns of the Economic Strategy Institute reported that Moore Tools is the world's best maker of ultra-precision machine tools. Fanuc is purchasing 40 percent of the Moore company with the right to take over the board in 2 years if Moore Tools does not make a profit during that time. It is my understanding from officials in the administration that the company is not expected to make a profit soon.

It is distressing that near control of Moore is being sold to the Japanese when there is, according to Government sources, an American company interested in the company.

Today's New York Times reported the administration cleared the sale although Moore Tools is considered a strategic company for the United States. According to the Times, "it is the only American company that makes precision machine tools that satisfy the requirements of the Defense and Energy Departments for making atomic weaponry." The other source for tools is the Japanese, Germans, and Swiss.

This sale should be stopped for several reasons. First, we should remember the Japanese deliberately targeted our machine tool industry.

The Government of Japan coordinated the attack of American industry while the Japanese companies dumped their machine tools in the United States. Japan's Government created bicycle races and passed through the profits from gambling to small Japanese companies not able to handle the dumping prices. Our machine tool industry was on its knees by the time the American Government finally moved to stop the dumping.

Second, we need to renew CFIUS which lapsed with the expiration of the Defense Production Act. However, we might have a difficult time doing it. The final SII Report of June 28, went into detail on CFIUS and stated "On May 29, 1990, the Secretary of the Treasury reaffirmed that Exon-Florio 'has not been and will not be used as a barrier to direct investment in the United States.'"

Third, the Treasury Department has recently carried this even further. Business Week, January 21, 1991, reported "that tough new lines on foreign investment is only a mirage." The story states that "Treasury Department lawyers were clipping the wings of the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States [CFIUS]. The committee 'can only probe the purchase of a majority stake in a U.S. business.'"

Third, pertinent to this sale is evidence that shows what can happen when a foreign company is in control of a product needed by our military. Mobay Chemical Co. a German company in the United States refused to sell chemicals to the Army for weaponry. When challenged they told the Army it is policy—so sue us.

Now, if this happened with a German company, what happens when, given the Japan's aversion to nuclear weapons, a Japanese company refuses to sell the necessary machines to the Department of Energy or Defense? We certainly will be at the mercy of foreign firms.

Fourth, the General Accounting Office right now is investigating the charges that Japanese companies are withholding special components from United States firms so they cannot manufacture various products. Probably, the best known example of this is Go-Video of Scottsdale, AZ.

I have first hand knowledge of this firm and its problems. The giant companies of Japan—Matsushita Electrical Industrial Co., Sharp Corp., and Sony have been involved in trying to quash this small American company. They even went to companies in other countries to stop Go-Video. Well, Americans never give up. These big companies will have to stand trial for trade conspiracy on April 2 in Phoenix, AZ.

It is time to change this alarming erosion of our industrial base. We must renew CFIUS and strengthen it. If foreign companies are withholding parts

to us—then it is imperative that we keep these strategic businesses in the United States. It is time for America to wake up—time for the American people to say enough is enough. We cannot lose this economic war.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 13, 1991]

WHO WILL BUILD AMERICA'S NUCLEAR ARMS?
(By Kevin L. Kearns)

Foreign takeovers of America's entertainment giants are arguably benign, but you'd think that someone would draw the line at a company involved in our nuclear weapons program. Unfortunately, you'd be wrong. Just such a takeover is imminent, and the hands-off attitude being adopted in Washington illustrates graphically the nation's abysmal lack of a sensible policy on foreign buyouts of U.S. businesses.

The acquisition target is Moore Special Tool Company, of Bridgeport, Conn., the world's best maker of ultra-precision machine tools, and one of America's industrial crown jewels. The prospective buyer is Fanuc, a major Japanese player in the machine tool field. Moore is the only U.S. supplier of high-precision machine tools that can meet Department of Energy needs. The components fabricated with these tools directly affect critical variables such as the explosive force of a nuclear weapon and the risk of accidental detonation.

The United States will now be totally dependent on foreign machines (German, Swiss and Japanese) for the most sensitive operations in maintaining the arsenal that has anchored its defense for almost 50 years. A double irony is that the most precise tools (from Moore) would be provided by Fanuc, whose home country has forsworn nuclear weapons as a matter of principle.

How did we wind up in such a fix? In general, it's the fault of the business environment in which U.S. companies operate. Our cost of capital is too high, partly as a result of government borrowing; our tax laws penalize investment and reward consumption; our piecemeal regulatory structure is insensitive to effects on international competitiveness. Moore also has specific problems of its own. The company has worked for the U.S. government on projects that were neither profitable nor applicable elsewhere. As a niche-market producer, Moore must depend on exports (more than 50 percent of sales) to generate enough volume to stay profitable. But because of the strategic value of Moore's machines, the Departments of Defense and Energy have blocked or delayed approval of key overseas sales.

Even so, the existence of alternative foreign suppliers has frustrated U.S. export control. Foreign customers, aware of Moore's problems in getting export licenses, have often settled for second-best but still satisfactory, products from other sources. The net result: Sales and profits dwindle for Moore but worrisome technology continues to spread as foreign competitors supported by their governments rush to fill the gap.

Concern that the machines might be misused or fall into the wrong foreign hands is valid, but the application of our export control laws often serves neither national security nor business interests. Ultimately, we can only influence the flows of technologies if we are a technology leader. If our companies are put out of business or sold to foreign concerns, then we have little leverage over the actions of others.

The lack of a coherent national economic strategy, where business decisions, government procurement, export control, antitrust

and tax policy are all linked, has produced this situation.

Washington's mechanism for reviewing sales of U.S. companies to foreign entities is CFIUS, the interagency Committee on Foreign Investment in the U.S. The committee's guidelines, known as the Exon-Florio provisions, say that the acquiring company must be shown to pose a national security risk for a sale to be denied. But how should national security be defined? Is it military security only or should it encompass economic security as well?

To date CFIUS has chosen to define security only in narrow military terms. Of some 480 takeovers reviewed, the process has blocked only one sale—to a company owned by the Chinese government. A bill to make economic security an explicit criterion in the decision-making process failed to pass in the last Congress. Indeed, Congress failed to renew the entire Defense Production Act, of which Exon-Florio is a part. As a result, the world's greatest economy currently has no guidelines whatsoever on foreign takeovers.

Operating in a legal vacuum, CFIUS last week voted informally to recommend that the president approve the sale of Moore to Fanuc. Although many CFIUS agencies were uneasy, none was courageous enough to recommend denial. But if ever there was a clear national security case, even according to the narrow definition, the Moore case is it. What could be more deeply involved in national security than the machines that produce the nation's nuclear arsenal?

The United States has a long history of controlling exports for political reasons. What if the Japanese, Germans or Swiss decide not to sell to or service the DOE's nuclear program? After all, Switzerland is a neutral, Germany does not possess nuclear weapons and has a large, politically active anti-nuclear movement, and sensitivity to things nuclear is integral to modern Japan. Can we rely on these governments never to respond to political considerations and to continue to sell to DOE? The grudging cooperation we have received from Germany and Japan in the Persian Gulf crisis, as well as the stalled GATT negotiations, demonstrates vividly that these countries often do not view their respective national interests as coincident with ours, even on critical issues.

Further, will these countries tightly control the technologies involved and keep them out of the hands of the Saddam Husseins of the world? German companies have been heavily involved in the Iraqi chemical, missile and nuclear-weapons programs. The Arab blacklist for years has influenced Japan's relations with Israel, and Japanese companies have sole restricted technologies—the most famous case being Toshiba Machine's sales to nuclear submarine propeller-quieting technology to the Soviets.

Moore's plight is far from unique. Another current CFIUS case, for example, is also mired in policy confusion: the sale of SemiGas Systems to its Japanese competitor, Nippon Sanso. SemiGas is the key supplier of specialized gas cabinets to Sematech, the government-business consortium established to help our computer chip industry become competitive again. Although the Japanese would stand to gain valuable insight into the technology of their U.S. competitors by acquiring SemiGas, CFIUS approved the sale in August. But last week, the Department of Justice, which did not object in the CFIUS process, announced it would go into court to block the sale on antitrust grounds.

With respect to the impending sale of Moore, ordinarily, the president would have

15 days to act on the case. But the normal rules have lapsed thanks to Congress's inaction. Moreover, the president has plenty on his plate currently. Yet critical cases like Moore cannot be allowed to slide through even when the White House is caught up in an immediate crisis. A way must be found to keep Moore and companies like it in U.S. hands and to help them to prosper.

The problem is that such measures would look like "industrial policy"—a taboo to some key White House economic policy makers. Yet export controls, which they accept, are also a form of industrial policy. Such controls certainly hurt Moore financially. The real problem is not that we might wander into industrial policy but that we already have too many industrial policies, too many uncoordinated laws and regulations that sandbag our companies in their competition with foreign rivals.

We desperately need a more strategic approach to our national economy. Decisions to block the Moore sale and fully support the Justice Department's suit against the SemiGas acquisition are the places to start.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 18, 1991]

U.S. CLEARS JAPANESE STAKE IN ATOMIC-ARMS TOOLMAKER

(By Clyde H. Farnsworth)

WASHINGTON, January 17.—The White House has approved a Japanese company's purchase of 40 percent of the only American company that makes precision machine tools that satisfy the requirements of the Defense and Energy Departments for making atomic weaponry.

The deal between the Fanuc Company of Japan, which makes robots and machine tools—machines that make other machines—and Moore Special Tool Inc. of Bridgeport, Conn., was hotly debated within the Bush Administration.

The Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States, a Government review panel, recommended late last month that the White House approve the deal, and that recommendation has been accepted, people involved in the process say. A White House announcement is expected soon, perhaps as early as next week.

Approval is likely to provoke reaction in Congress, where many lawmakers think the Government should be taking stronger action to keep national security technology in American hands.

"Failure to stop this sale sends a clear signal that everything, no matter how vital to our interests, is for sale in the U.S.," said Representative Mel Levine, Democrat of California, chairman of the House High Technology Caucus.

The review panel has examined 517 foreign investments in the last three years, only one of which was blocked—a Chinese company's effort to acquire Mamco Manufacturing Inc., a Seattle company that makes aircraft components.

Foreign investments are reviewed under a law that permitted the President to block foreign purchases deemed a threat to national security. The 1988 Exon-Florio law has lapsed, but it is expected to be revived by the 102d Congress, and the Administration has proceeded as if the legislation were in effect.

The purchase of 40 percent of Moore, a private company employing 400 people in a plant near the Bridgeport airport, has been the subject of a debate within the Administration since the middle of last year, when the agreement with Fanuc was reached.

The Defense, Energy and Commerce Departments initially objected to the deal,

fearing that vital security used to build nuclear weapons would pass to the Japanese. The State and Treasury Departments supported the deal, saying that if Moore did not find a strong financial partner it would close and the Government would lose the technology entirely.

Moore has been in the red for two years, and in recent years one of its prime sources of credit was the Bank of New England, which the Federal Government seized last week, saying it was insolvent.

To satisfy the critics' concern about Japanese access to weapons technology, Moore and Fanuc agreed to strict rules about what information would be shared. Fanuc officials, who will have two seats on Moore's five-member board, described their investment as passive and said they were interested only in the technology used for making machine tools used for nonmilitary products.

Moore's main products are computer-operated jig borers that gouge tiny, highly accurate holes in metal, and other precision machining equipment.

In addition to their use in making atomic weapons at Energy Department plants in Oak Ridge, Tenn., and Rocky Flats, Colo., the company's products are widely used in the manufacture of watches, cameras and other products.

More than 60 percent of Moore's output is exported, but because of their strategic value, the Moore tools often required Government export licenses that were not easy to obtain. The blocking or delay of major overseas sales is said to be one reason for the company's financial troubles.

The Fanuc deal was originally drawn so that within five years either the Japanese company or the Moore family, which controls the American company, could buy the other out.

This raised some Government objections that Fanuc could end up in undisputed control, so the agreement was modified, leaving the Moore family with the right to buy out Fanuc but no reciprocal right for the Japanese.

Under the revised agreement, should Moore continue to lose money over the next two years, Fanuc would take effective control of the company by naming a third director. Fanuc says one of its two initial directors will be American, and that if it is entitled to name a third director that person would also be an American.

Fanuc's control of the board would continue until Moore turned a profit, when the third board seat would be given up, under the agreement.

DECISION CALLED UNFORTUNATE

Kevin L. Kearns, a former Senate Foreign Relations Committee staff member now with the Economic Strategy Institute, a Washington research group, called the decision unfortunate and said it underscored that the United States "does not have any strategy for dealing with the surge of investment."

One Government official, who spoke on condition of anonymity, said the review panel had been persuaded that no similar technology could be purchased abroad. The decision, he said, came to a choice of "either save the company or lose the technology."

The company was founded by Richard F. Moore, who died two years ago. His son, Wayne R. Moore, a champion swimmer at Yale in the 1950's and a former Olympic gold medalist, is now president. He could not be reached for comment.

[From Business Week, Jan. 21, 1991]
**THAT TOUGH NEW LINE ON FOREIGN
 INVESTMENT IS ONLY A MIRAGE**
 (By Paul Magnusson)

When the Justice Dept. filed suit on Jan. 3 to block a Japanese company's planned purchase of a San Jose (Calif.) maker of semiconductor manufacturing equipment, critics of foreign purchases of U.S. companies rejoiced. Coming on the heels of Interior Secretary Manuel Lujan Jr.'s outrage at the prospect of Japanese ownership of concessions in Yosemite National Park, the Bush Administration seemed to be taking a tougher line on foreign investment.

It appears that the celebrations were premature. Justice officials insist their opposition to the planned purchase of Semi-Gas Systems Inc. by Nippon Sanso was based entirely on antitrust concerns. In a suit filed in Philadelphia, the government charges that the acquisition would give the Japanese company too much control of the market for equipment to handle the hazardous gases used in semiconductor manufacturing.

CAPITOL SPARK

The government says the merged companies would control 48% of the U.S. market and a third of the world market. Filing suit, says Assistant Attorney General James F. Rill, "was purely an anti-trust decision" and was not cleared by the White House.

In fact, on other fronts, the Administration seems to be retreating from confrontations over foreign investment—a stance Congress may move swiftly to reverse. Even as Justice was moving against Nippon Sanso, Treasury Dept. lawyers were clipping the wings of the Committee on Foreign Investment in the U.S. (CFTUS). Until now, the interagency panel felt free to investigate technology transfers resulting from any foreign investment in a U.S. company. Under the new rules, CFTUS can only probe the purchase of a majority stake in a U.S. business.

Among those cases immediately affected were a proposed joint venture between Mitsubishi Advanced Materials and UCAR Carbon, a Danbury (Conn.) subsidiary of Union Carbide that manufactures graphite composites for Stealth aircraft. Another deal ruled off limits by the Treasury lawyers was Sanyo Electric Co.'s plan to buy 5% of Areal, a San Jose company that enjoys a lead in the technology for making glass platters for computer disk drives.

Critics charge that the Treasury has emasculated the committee. While the group has examined 495 cases, it has started investigations of only a dozen, and the President has blocked just one acquisition.

WORRIER

Congress will likely make an early effort to strengthen CFTUS. The Defense Production Act, which includes the agency's charter, expired last year and must be renewed. Representative Mel Levine (D-Calif.) says there is a concentration of certain high-tech industries in foreign hands. "We are ceding our ability to control our economic destiny through what amounts to a fire sale of American assets," says Levine. Congress may also try to broaden the definition of "national security" that the President can invoke to block a sale. Several Democratic proposals call for consideration of "economic security" when evaluating deals.

Senator J. James Exon (D-Neb.), co-sponsor of the 1988 amendment that gave CFTUS its new powers, says it should have broad discretion: "If we had a U.S. tiddlywink manufacturer who provided tiddlywinks to

our troops in the Mideast, then the President ought to be able to tell a foreign company, 'You can't acquire them.'"

The disappointment of critics as they learn that the move against Nippon Sanso wasn't what it seemed will only strengthen congressional resolve to put the teeth back in CFTUS. The Administration doesn't like the idea, but it probably can't stop it.

□ 1640

WHY I VOTED "NO" ON THE RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, as I stand in the well of the House today I think about the Members of the U.S. Congress who in 1917, voted to take this country into World War I—a war which, it was said, would end all wars, but in reality accomplished nothing but the loss of millions of lives and perhaps accelerated the rise of Hitler.

Mr. Speaker, today I think back upon the abdication of responsibility of the United States Congress during the Vietnam war—and the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, passed unanimously by this House, but later regretted by many who supported it for the rest of their lives.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the men and women of the U.S. Armed Forces who are, at this moment, putting their lives on the line in the Persian Gulf, and who have already performed with great courage and ability under fire. I rise today to condemn Saddam Hussein, the vicious dictator of Iraq, for his brutal invasion of Kuwait and for his bombing of Israel, and to demand Iraq's immediate withdrawal from Kuwait.

I rise today to tell you that I voted against the resolution before us because I cannot indicate support for a President whose policies in the Persian Gulf are, to my mind, absolutely wrong and could lead to terrible loss of life for our young men and women—as well as for the people of the entire region. A policy which leads to unnecessary loss of life for young Americans, and to terrible suffering for their families, is not, to my mind, supporting our troops.

Mr. Speaker, I fear that President Bush will interpret this resolution in the precise way that Lyndon Johnson interpreted the Gulf of Tonkin resolution—that is, in support of his policies in the Persian Gulf.

Let us firmly support the young men and women in the Persian Gulf with all our hearts and all our abilities. But let us say no to the President's policy which, from the beginning of this crisis, has been inadequate in attempting to resolve it in a nonviolent manner.

Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely incomprehensible to me, that with virtually every nation on Earth united against

Saddam Hussein, a two-bit dictator, that this crisis could not have been resolved without war.

Mr. Speaker, even as the bombs are falling today on Israel, on Saudi Arabia, on Iraq, and on Kuwait, the United States Congress cannot abdicate its responsibility to do everything in its power to make every last possible effort to prevent unnecessary bloodshed and to support our troops in the most basic way—by bringing them home alive and well. Let us ask the President to stop the bombing now, have the Secretary General of the United Nations go to Iraq immediately to negotiate a cease-fire and begin negotiations for the withdrawal of Iraq from Kuwait.

Mr. Speaker, a few months ago the entire world rejoiced that the cold war had finally ended, and that the hundreds and hundreds of billions of dollars being spent on bombs and tanks and missiles could finally be used to improve human life—not to destroy human life. Mr. Speaker, a major war in the Persian Gulf, costing us thousands of lives and tens of billions of dollars, could well be a disaster for the people of our country—especially the working people, the poor people, the elderly, and the children. I predict that this Congress will soon be asked for more money for guided missiles, but there will be no money available to house the homeless. I predict that this Congress will soon be asked for more money for tanks, but there will be no money or effort available to develop a national health care system, guaranteeing health care for all of our people—as virtually all of the industrialized world has. I predict that this Congress will soon be asked for more money for bombs, but there will be no money available to reindustrialize our Nation so that our working people can have decent-paying jobs. There will be no money available for education and for our children—25 percent of whom live in poverty. There will be no money available for the environment, or to help the family farmer—many of whom are being forced off the land today in my State of Vermont and throughout the country. Mr. Speaker, I predict that in order to pay for this war, there will be more cutbacks in Medicare for the elderly and even an effort to cut back on Social Security payments.

Mr. Speaker, I voted "no" on this resolution because this Congress cannot continue to abdicate its responsibilities to the President. Rather, we must, day after day, do everything in our power to stop the violence and find a peaceful resolution to this crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I will pray tonight for the young men and women of this country who are in the Persian Gulf and for their families. Let us do everything in our power to bring them home alive and well.

PAYING FOR THE WAR: IMPORT SURCHARGES ON THOSE WHO DO NOT CONTRIBUTE

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. **STARK**] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. **STARK**. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today to ensure that the cost of the war in the Persian Gulf is paid for on a fairer basis by those who benefit from the liberation of Kuwait.

How will we pay for this war? The United States is in a recession. Unemployment is rising. Our deficit this fiscal year is about \$323 billion—the equivalent of \$10,300 in new red ink every second. The war will add a huge unknown amount to this staggering burden. Estimates vary widely depending on the length of the war, but range between about \$30 and \$90 billion. We shouldn't pile up more red ink by increasing the deficit. Imposing taxes on working Americans will only deepen the recession.

Many members of the United Nations who supported the resolutions against Saddam Hussein have contributed little or nothing to the war effort. Japan and Germany particularly come to mind. Some of these nations will receive enormous benefits by the liberation of Kuwait and a return to lower cost oil supply stability in the Persian Gulf. For example, with the fantastic successes of American and Allied forces on the first day of the war, the price of oil fell \$10 a barrel.

I believe those who have not contributed but who stand to benefit by the blood, sweat, and tears of America should help pay for the cost of the war.

Therefore, my bill imposes a trade surtax—similar to the GATT-sanctioned balance of payments surtax—on the imports of products from countries based on their historical use of Persian Gulf oil. The surtax would be reduced by the amount of national expenditure that a particular country made in support of the war.

The surtax would be temporary, expiring once the cost of the war was recovered from the beneficiaries. The United States also uses Persian Gulf oil and the bill would not charge our trading partners for the proportion of gulf oil used by the United States. The exception from the surtax for de minimis users of oil from the gulf will protect the world's least developed nations from this extra expense.

Of course, an import surtax is a tax on Americans who use imported products—and that is all of us. But this tax will at least be absorbed in part by our trading partners who have not contributed to the cost of the Persian Gulf war. For example, to maintain market share and the volume of sales, many exporters to the United States will absorb all or part of the cost of the surtax, reducing their profit margins on the sales. To protect their exports to the lucrative U.S. market, some governments are likely to increase their direct contribution to the war effort, thus reducing the size of the surtax on their products. Our trading partners who do not contribute adequately to the war effort will be penalized by American consumers, who will purchase the products of our helpful allies or domestic products.

There is no ideal tax—but I can think of no better way of paying for this U.N. war than

making sure that foreign freeloaders bear a fair share of the cost. While my proposal is not fully consistent with the GATT, it is temporary, deals with a clear economic emergency, and is the fairest way to ensure that all members of the United Nations do their duty.

GIVING FULL SUPPORT TO OUR ARMED FORCES IN THE PERSIAN GULF

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. **PARKER**] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. **PARKER**. Mr. Speaker, what all individuals of goodwill and peace had hoped could be avoided has occurred. The President, along with other world leaders, has made the decision that we, as a nation and a part of the international community, must move on Iraq. The die has been cast, and there is no turning back.

The President has said, military action "will be swift and massive * * * we will not have another Vietnam." I support the President, and I pray that his assessment of the timeframe is right.

But this crisis may last much longer than the American people want to believe. Although we are encouraged by the initial reports of military successes, America must prepare to support a long-term engagement if necessary. Because there is one thing of which I am certain—this will not be another Vietnam.

Now is the time for the Nation to unite, to demonstrate a unified national resolve and stand with the President. In so doing, we commit full support to the men and women of our Armed Forces, ensuring them of the total backing of their Government and of their country as they engage in battle.

Since we have been forced into war, let us do it and finish it. Every American should pray for our Nation and our troops in the Middle East. The future of world stability is in the balance.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. **MARLENEE** (at the request of Mr. **MICHEL**), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. **MORRISON** (at the request of Mr. **MICHEL**), for today, on account of official business.

Ms. **SNOWE** (at the request of Mr. **MICHEL**), for today, on account of illness in the family.

Mr. **WEISS** (at the request of Mr. **GEPHARDT**), for today, on account of medical reasons.

Mr. **CLEMENT** (at the request of Mr. **GEPHARDT**), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

The following Members (at the request of Mr. **CAMPBELL** of California) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. **DORNAN** of California, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. **CAMPBELL** of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. **BENTLEY**, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. **BENTLEY**, for 60 minutes each day, on January 29 and 30.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. **SERRANO**) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. **DE LUGO**, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. **SCHUMER**, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. **SANDERS**, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. **ANNUNZIO**, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. **STARK**, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. **EDWARDS** of California, for 30 minutes each day, on January 23, 24, and 25.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

The following Members (at the request of Mr. **CAMPBELL** of California) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. **SOLOMON** in two instances.

Mr. **FISH**.

Mr. **WELDON**.

Mr. **GREEN** of New York.

Ms. **ROS-LEHTINEN** in two instances.

Mr. **BLILEY**.

Mr. **LENT**.

Mr. **PORTER**.

Mrs. **BENTLEY**.

Mr. **HORTON**.

Mr. **BILIRAKIS**.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. **SERRANO**) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. **BONIOR**.

Mr. **MRAZEK**.

Mr. **TORRICELLI**.

Mr. **HUBBARD**.

Mr. **HALL** of Ohio in two instances.

Mr. **MAZZOLI** in two instances.

Mr. **ATKINS**.

Mr. **WEISS**.

Mr. **GUARINI** in two instances.

Mr. **TRAFICANT**.

Mr. **DONNELLY** in five instances.

Mr. **STUDDS**.

Mr. **RAHALL** in two instances.

Mr. **LIPINSKI**.

Mr. **PANETTA**.

Mr. **LEHMAN** of Florida.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. **MCCLOSKEY**. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, January 22, 1991, at 12 noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of the rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

439. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of Council Resolution 8-328, "Transfer of Jurisdiction over Lot 812 in Square 2939, S.O. 89-221, Resolution of 1990," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

440. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of Council Resolution 8-330, "Commission to Study Reparation Proposals for African American Support Resolution of 1990," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

441. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of Council Resolution 8-329, "Transfer of Jurisdiction over a Portion of U.S. Reservation 360, S.O. 89-245, Resolution of 1990," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

442. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistant Agency, transmitting the Department of the Army's proposed lease of defense articles to Denmark (Transmittal No. 4-91), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

443. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting his notification that, pursuant to Executive Order 12730, foreign policy controls will be expanded to include two chemicals that can be used in the production of chemical weapons, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. app. 2405(o)(1); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

444. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

445. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting his notification directing U.S. Armed Forces to commence combat operations on January 16, 1991, against Iraqi forces and military targets in Iraq and Kuwait, consistent with the War Powers Resolution (H. Doc. No. 102-30); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

446. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for Fiscal Year 1990, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

447. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting a copy of the report of the Proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 331; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

448. A letter from the Director of Personnel Management, transmitting a copy of the civil service retirement and disability fund [CSRDF] annual report for fiscal year 1988, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 1308(a); 31 U.S.C. 9503; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Post Office and Civil Service.

449. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the calendar year 1989 wildfire rehabilitation report for Department of Interior administered lands, pursuant to Public Law 101-286, section 202(1) (104 Stat. 174); jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Agriculture.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. BYRON:

H.R. 557. A bill to provide additional support for the members of the Armed Forces participating in operations in the Persian Gulf region by improving military personnel policies and compensation, by extending the time for performing certain acts under the internal revenue laws, and by preserving the student loan repayment grace period; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services, Ways and Means, and Education and Labor.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

H.R. 558. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to make small business concerns owned and controlled by special disabled veterans eligible to receive procurement contracts awards under that Act; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. MFUME, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. WALSH, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. MACHTELEY, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. HERTEL, and Mr. ESPY):

H.R. 559. A bill to make the independence of the Baltic Republics a condition on the granting of most-favored-nation treatment to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. TALLON, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MORAN, Mr. STARK, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. WISE, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. OLIN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, and Mr. CONDIT):

H.R. 560. A bill to increase America's energy security in ways that are environmentally desirable and economically affordable; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce; Science, Space, and Technology; and Ways and Means.

By Mr. DONNELLY:

H.R. 561. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require the recapture of certain losses of savings and loan associations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 562. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the distance requirements applicable to the deduction for moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 563. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that amounts paid to acquire certain intangible items are treated as being paid for goodwill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 564. A bill to repeal the increase provided under the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 in the base composite rate used to determine the amount of payment for dialysis services under title XVIII of the Social Security Act; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself and Mr. VANDER JAGT):

H.R. 565. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a permanent extension of the targeted jobs credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DONNELLY:

H.R. 566. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to exempt skilled nursing facilities from certain requirements relating to advance directives, to provide an exemption from those requirements for providers of services electing not to be subject to the requirements based upon moral, ethical, or religious beliefs, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota:

H.R. 567. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Fort Totten National Historic Site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DYMALLY:

H.R. 568. A bill to create the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ENGLISH (for himself, Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma):

H.R. 569. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of certain historic military forts in the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN of New York:

H.R. 570. A bill regarding certain entries of N-Acetylsulfanilic acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUARINI (for himself, Mr. YATES, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. GALLO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. HORTON, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. RAVENEL, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 571. A bill to repeal the concessioner preferences of the National Park Services Concessions Policy Act, to require that concessions be awarded pursuant to a competitive bidding process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GUARINI (for himself and Mr. GALLO):

H.R. 572. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income the value of certain transportation furnished by an employer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. OAKAR:

H.R. 573. A bill to provide that members of the uniformed branch of the U.S. Postal Inspection Service be treated as law enforcement officers for retirement purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 574. A bill to amend the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 575. A bill to provide for a demonstration project relating to treatment for drug abuse and alcohol abuse under the health benefits program for Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 576. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to restore the 3-year basis recovery rule with respect to annuities under chapters 83 and 84 of such title for Federal income tax purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service and Ways and Means.

By Mr. OWENS of New York:

H.R. 577. A bill to require the Bureau of Labor Statistics to collect and report unemployment and related statistics by congressional districts; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 578. A bill to provide for fair and non-partisan administration of Federal elections; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 579. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to eliminate the effect of the parental exception to the kidnapping prohibition in cases of kidnappings in violation of valid custody orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 580. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to require the disclosure of certain information in connection with the solicitation of charitable contributions by mail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PANETTA:

H.R. 581. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat parsonage allowances as compensation for purposes of the limitations on benefits payable under defined benefit plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PICKETT:

H.R. 582. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for special immigrant status for certain aliens who have served honorably (or are enlisted to serve) in the Armed Forces of the United States for at least 12 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAHALL:

H.R. 583. A bill to amend chapters 83 and 84 of title 5, United States Code, to make applicable to mine safety and health inspectors certain provisions which are currently applicable to law enforcement officers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RINALDO:

H.R. 584. A bill to extend the temporary suspensions of duty on certain oxygen-function amino compounds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHEUER (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. MINETA, Ms. LONG, Mr. MANTON, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. PEASE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. WALSH, Mr. RITTER, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. GILMAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. FALCONE, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. PRICE, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. GEJDESEN, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. HOCHBERG, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. CLAY, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. ROE, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. JONTZ, and Mr. BONIOR):

H.R. 585. A bill to establish a national policy for the conservation of biological diversity; to support environmental research and training necessary for conservation and sustainable use of biotic natural resources, to establish mechanisms for carrying out the national policy and for coordinating related activities; and to facilitate the collection, synthesis, and dissemination of information necessary for these purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mr. PANETTA):

H.R. 586. A bill to require regular reports to the Congress on the amount of expenditures made to carry out Operation Desert Shield and Operation Desert Storm and on the amount of contributions made to the United States by foreign countries to support Operation Desert Shield and Operation Desert Storm; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STARK:

H.R. 587. A bill to amend title 19, United States Code, section 2132 to provide temporary import surcharges to compensate for the disproportionate cost to the United

States of America of the Persian Gulf war of 1991; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H.R. 588. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide a marker for each grave in which the remains of a veteran are buried; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WASHINGTON:

H.R. 589. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to authorize States and local political subdivisions of States to use Social Security account numbers for jury selection purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLILEY (for himself, Mr. RHODES, and Mr. ROHRBACHER):

H.J. Res. 79. Joint resolution disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Assault Weapon Manufacturing Strict Liability Act of 1990; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. COX of California (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. RITTER, Mr. HYDE, Mr. APLEGATE, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. ESPY, Mr. HENRY, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. McEWEN, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. PEASE, Mr. DREIER of California, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. SARPALIS, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. LENT, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. HASTERT):

H.J. Res. 80. Joint resolution to revoke recently extended United States taxpayer subsidies to the Soviet Union as a consequence of its attacks on freedom of the press and democracy in the Baltic Republics in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs; Agriculture; Ways and Means; and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DICKINSON (for himself, Mr. APLEGATE, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. GALLO, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. PORTER, Mr. QUILLLEN, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. STUMP, and Mr. WALSH):

H.J. Res. 81. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States establishing English as the official language of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H.J. Res. 82. Joint resolution designating September 25, 1991 as "National Reporters Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SOLOMON:

H.J. Res. 83. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing the Congress and the States to prohibit the act of physical desecration of the flag of the United States and to set criminal penalties for that act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL (for himself, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. YATRON, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr.

COX of California, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HOYER, Mrs. KENNEDY, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MANTON, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. MOAKLEY, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. MOODY, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. ROE, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut):

H. Con. Res. 40. Concurrent resolution condemning the recent use of Soviet military force in the Baltic States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FEIGHAN (for himself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. WEBER, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. PAXON, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. YATRON, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. WEISS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. UDALL, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FALCONE, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. ROTH, Mr. HYDE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. GOSS, Mr. FROST, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. LEHMAN of Florida):

H. Con. Res. 41. Concurrent resolution condemning the Iraqi attack against Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H. Con. Res. 42. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress in favor of the more equitable and more uniform treatment of federally funded and federally administered retirement programs for purposes of any deficit reduction measures; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. RAHALL:

H. Con. Res. 43. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that Israel should take immediate steps to reopen all the universities in the West Bank and Gaza; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SHAW (for himself, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. FISH, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. APLEGATE, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. FROST, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. HYDE, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. KYL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. McDADE, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. CALAHAN, Mr. REGULA, Mr. GALLO, Mr. MANTON, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. CRANE, Mr. RHODES, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. DOR-

NAN of California, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. REED, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. COBLE, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, and Mr. VANDER JAGT):

H. Con. Res. 44. Concurrent resolution calling upon the people of the United States to display the American flag in show of support for the U.S. troops stationed in the Persian Gulf region; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES:

H. Con. Res. 45. Concurrent resolution permitting the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony to commemorate the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. BOXER:

H. Res. 37. Resolution relating to press coverage of military actions in the Persian Gulf; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H. Res. 38. Resolution to commend the U.S. maritime industry and maritime community for their commitment to and cooperation with U.S. military forces involved in Operation Desert Shield; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FUSTER:

H.R. 590. A bill for the relief of Edgardo, Ismael, Juan Carlos, and Edilliam Cotto Roman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H.R. 591. A bill for the relief of Petro Ruban; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 3: Mr. BORSKI, Mr. AU COIN, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. GORDON, Mr. CAMP, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

H.R. 8: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 25: Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. BACCHUS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. JONES of Georgia, and Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey.

H.R. 29: Mr. WYLIE.

H.R. 53: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, and Mr. FAZIO.

H.R. 127: Mr. ROE, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GOSS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. PRICE, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. BUCHER, Mr. WALSH, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. WOLF, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. ECKART, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. HORTON, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FOGLETTA, and Mr. HUGHES.

H.R. 134: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. YATES, Mr. PENNY, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. ROE, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. HORTON, Mr. FOGLETTA, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. ESPY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. KLECZKA, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. MORAN, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. HYDE, and Mr. DWYER of New Jersey.

H.R. 179: Mr. EMERSON, Mr. QUILLEN, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. FUSTER.

H.R. 233: Mr. DELAY.

H.R. 246: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. MCCREY, Mr. DELAY, Mr. ROE, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. TALLON, Mr. WALKER, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. LOWERY of California, and Mr. RHODES.

H.R. 248: Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 249: Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 253: Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.

H.R. 303: Mr. STOKES, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. FAZIO, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. LAFALCE, and Mr. MRAZEK.

H.R. 317: Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. ECKART, Mr. MANTON, Mr. WISE, and Mr. FAZIO.

H.R. 321: Mrs. BOXER, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. GORDON, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. MINETA, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 327: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 328: Mr. CLINGER and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 330: Mr. ROSE, Mr. RAVENEL, and Mr. DWYER of New Jersey.

H.R. 371: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 381: Mr. BRUCE, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. WALSH, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. FASCELL, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. JENKINS, and Mr. HUGHES.

H.R. 384: Mr. JONTZ, Mr. LEACH, Mr. UDALL, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. OLIN, and Mrs. SCHROEDER.

H.R. 385: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. QUILLEN, and Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

H.R. 414: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 447: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. FOGLETTA, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. ROE, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. STARK, Mr. STOKES, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. WYDEN.

H.R. 473: Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. PACKARD, and Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

H.R. 474: Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. SKEEN, and Mr. RAY.

H.R. 481: Mr. GORDON and Mrs. PATTERSON.

H.R. 482: Mr. GILMAN, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MANTON, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 525: Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. PAXON, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. ROE, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. FROST, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. HYDE, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. GUARINI.

H.R. 555: Mr. KOPETSKI.

H.R. 556: Mr. GORDON and Mr. MCCLOSKEY.

H.J. Res. 1: Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. BEILSONSON, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DIXON, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FOGLETTA, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. GREEN of New York, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MOODY, Mrs. MORELLA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PENNY, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. STARK, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. WHEAT, and Mr. YATES.

H.J. Res. 51: Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. IRELAND, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. REGULA, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. SAXTON, and Mrs. BOXER.

H. Con. Res. 14: Mr. FROST, Mr. ROE, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. LANCASTER, and Mr. BONIOR.

H. Con. Res. 23: Mr. POSHARD.

H. Con. Res. 35: Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. LENT, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SHAW, Mr. RITTER, and Mr. DORNAN of California.

H. Res. 33: Mr. HENRY and Mr. RITTER.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN MEMORY OF THE LATE
COUNCILMAN GILBERT LINDSAY

HON. MERVYN M. DYMALLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1991

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, during the holiday recess, my good friend, Los Angeles Councilman Gilbert Lindsay passed away.

I first met Councilman Lindsay in 1960, during the Kennedy campaign. He and I became best friends. We both entered public office the same year in 1963. The "Emperor" of the Great Ninth District, as he was fondly called, will be missed by his friends, colleagues, and constituents.

May he rest in peace. As part of his tribute, I would like to include the following January 9, 1991 article about the late Councilman Lindsay from the Los Angeles Sentinel, the largest African-American newspaper on the west coast.

[From the Los Angeles Sentinel, Jan. 3-9, 1991]

COUNCILMAN GILBERT LINDSAY IS DEAD AT
THE AGE OF 90

(By A.S. Doc Young)

When Los Angeles City Councilman Gilbert W. Lindsay first described himself years ago as "the Emperor of the Great Ninth District," some people—fellow politicians among them—snickered.

They thought the claim was imperious, pompous, arrogant, hilarious. But, like the last baseball legend, Satchel Paige, Gil Lindsay was an American original, one of a kind and colorful both in speech and deed, a unique individual.

And, as Dr. Josie Bain, an administrative analyst at UCLA, said shortly after his death, "His uniqueness enabled him to say things and get away with things that others couldn't say."

Like Satch, when Lindsay spoke on his unique style and manner, he captured the attention of all who heard him. When he made political pitches, like Satch, he won impressively, establishing himself as a most unforgettable character in the process.

On issues and in matters large and small, downtown and uptown, he won so often and so skillfully that the snickering stopped, and the cynics realized that what he was, really, was awesome!

Just how awesome was conclusively proven in the hours following his death at 2:11 Friday morning, December 28, in the Queen of Angels/Hollywood Presbyterian Medical Center. He died as a result of a long illness which began with a severe stroke in early September that left him paralyzed on his right side and unable to speak and, at the end, was complicated by a heart attack.

It was proven by the warm, sincere, glowing tributes and testimonials paid to him by his peers and countless others who had known him. Not only was he highly praised for his great political achievements but also for numerous acts of human kindness.

"Gil Lindsay proved that you could do anything you wanted," said John Ferraro, president of the Los Angeles City Council; and Councilman Robert Farrell said: "He had a profound impact on the city. His hands and fingerprints are as much on downtown Los Angeles and the core of the city as anybody's."

"Under Councilman Lindsay's guidance," Mayor Tom Bradley said, "Central City became one of the premiere urban business centers in the country and the world. Downtown Los Angeles contains nationally recognized restaurants, cultural activities, gleaming skyscrapers, and developments that reflect rich cultural diversity."

His leadership of the Great Ninth District has included the development of senior citizens housing, recreation centers, child care centers, and the creation of the Vermont/Slauson Shopping Center."

Bradley also said: "He was a beloved public servant, one who declared on many occasions that he was going to be emperor and councilman for life. He got his wish."

"He's been a long, hard worker," City Councilman Nate Holden said. "He was like a father to me. In fact, he looked like my father. I loved Gil Lindsay, and I still do."

Lindsay, who spent 27 years in the Los Angeles City Council after becoming its first Black member in 1963 at age 63, left behind credits galore that none less than a long, hard worker could have amassed.

The Great Ninth District extends from 81st Street on the south to Chinatown on the north. Lindsay liked to say that he was on call for his constituents 24 hours a day, seven days a week, 365 days a year. He demanded the same availability from his deputies, wearing out several of them who could not keep up the pace.

"In his prime, he could wear you out," said Deputy Councilman Robert Gay, who worked for him for 16 years. "He was really a man's man. He walked faster than most men. His grip was stronger. He could drink men under the table. . . ."

Hard-working Gilbert W. Lindsay was the chairman of the Council's Public Works Committee, vice-chairman of the Arts, Health and Humanities Committee, and was a member of the Community and Economic Development Committee.

"During his nearly three decades in office," City News Service Writer Cathy Franklin said, "the downtown area exploded into one of the premiere business centers in the world."

During his tenure, the Ninth District gained more than 24 million square feet of office, commercial-retail, and service-industry space. In addition, more than 4200 hotel rooms and 400,000 square feet of convention-exhibit space are now available in the Central City.

Other highlights of Lindsay's administration included the redevelopment of Little Tokyo and Chinatown. He worked to expand the amount of senior citizens housing in the downtown and South Central areas through projects such as the Stovall Foundation, Philips Temple Community Housing, and the Lindsay Recreational Center.

Also located in his district is the Angelus Plaza complex, the largest publicly subsidized senior citizens housing facility in the country with 1094 units.

His work in revitalizing the South Central area included the \$12 million Vermont/Slauson Shopping Center and the creation of more than \$14 million in low-interest loans to homeowners for rebuilding projects.

Lindsay also created child care centers such as the Children's Collective, the Betty Boop Child Care Center, and the Delta Sigma Theta Child Care Centers.

The California Medical Hospital dedicated the Gilbert W. Lindsay Child Abuse Center for the councilman's contributions to the Central City community.

As if all that did not make enough demands on his time and talents, Lindsay was an active member of the Democratic State Committee, the American Legion, the YMCA, Los Angeles Area Council, Boy Scouts of America, the Urban League, Town Hall and the Rotary and Kiwanis clubs.

"Personally," said City Councilwoman Ruth Galanter, "I learned a great deal about how this city works just by watching Gil Lindsay."

Congressman Mervyn M. Dymally said: "Councilman Gil Lindsay will go down in history as one of the great politicians of our time. I first met him when I worked for the Kennedy campaign, under the leadership of then-Assemblyman Gus Hawkins, and we remained friends over the last 30 years. He was a practical non-nonsense legislator. In my judgment, history will be kind in recording his accomplishments."

"In his prime," said Councilman Zev Yaroslavsky, "Gil Lindsay was one of the savviest politicians around. He will long be remembered for paving the way for minority representation in the City Council."

Councilman Richard Alatorre said: "We have lost a leading citizen and public servant. Gilbert Lindsay devoted his entire life to working for his constituents and this work gave meaning to his life . . . it was his life."

City Attorney James K. Hahn said: "Gilbert Lindsay never let anyone forget that the renaissance of downtown was in his 'Great Ninth' District, and he never took a back seat to anyone. He was loyal to his friends, no matter the cost."

Los Angeles County Supervisor Kenneth Hahn, the father of James K. Hahn said: "During his council career, Lindsay championed the cause of civil rights and projects that would benefit his Great Ninth District. He took care of the little and big things for his constituents. He was thoughtful, kind, considerate, and generous with his actions."

Someone else compared Gil Lindsay to the late Richard J. Daley, legendary mayor of Chicago (his son, Richard M. Daley is now mayor of that city).

But California Assembly Speaker Pro Tem Mike Roos captured the essence of Lindsay's career when he said, "His life was a true Horatio Alger story, an outstanding example of someone rising from humble origins to become a major, positive force in the City of Los Angeles. As the guiding force behind much of the major development planning in

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

downtown Los Angeles, his place in our city's history is secure."

Gil Lindsay was born on a Mississippi cotton plantation on November 29, 1900. When he was a teenager, he left Mississippi and enrolled in a school in Pittsburgh. From there, he moved to Arizona, where he served with the U.S. Army in the 10th Cavalry and the 25th Infantry.

As part of an Army program, Lindsay attended the University of Arizona's School of Business Administration.

After leaving the military, Lindsay moved to Los Angeles and took a job as a janitor for the Department of Water and Power. While working, he continued to take classes in governmental administration and political science at USC and in business administration at UCLA.

C.A. (Bob) Barber first met Gil Lindsay in 1940.

"He was a janitor," Barber, a Los Angeles businessman, said. "His wife was from Greenville, Texas, about 75 miles from my home in Mt. Pleasant. . . . The thing I remember most vividly is that Gil Lindsay always was determined to do things, to be the best."

"He was a hellova janitor! That was an important job for Negroes in Los Angeles at that time. He gave the janitor's job the same respect he gave the council position. Whatever Gil was doing was very important to him."

Ruth Galanter said: "Mr. Lindsay's death marks not only the passing of a great man, but also of an era. Mr. Lindsay saw and overcame all the obstacles in his way. . . ."

"He made it!" Robert Farrel said. "He was 63 years old when he was appointed to the City Council. In ages 63 to 90, he exceeded everybody's expectations. When he was appointed to the City Council, some people expressed cynicism. 'What's his background?' they wanted to know. They were shocked when they were told that he used to be a janitor. But, he turned around where he came from and what he had done and made them a badge of pride. . . . He wore them as a badge of pride to stimulate and motivate people. Gil was a genius in his own way."

Lindsay, who had come to Los Angeles in 1923 (as one source has reported) or in 1924 (as he told me years ago), worked for the Department of Water and Power for 25 years—in the basement. Even after he became a DWP clerk, he worked in the basement. It was as if a department head was trying to hide him!

Lindsay began his political career in 1934, when he helped Augustus F. Hawkins run for the California State Assembly. (Hawkins recently retired after 28 years as a member of the U.S. Congress).

In 1947, Kenneth Hahn was teaching a class in political science at Pepperdine University, which was then located in South Los Angeles. One of Hahn's students was Herbert Howard, Lindsay's stepson.

One day, after Hahn told his class he was planning to run for the Los Angeles City Council, Howard said: "You should see my dad." Hahn agreed to go to see him. Howard also took Hahn to meet the late Rev. Clayton Russell, a minister often compared to New York City's Adam Clayton Powell, Jr., who was the pastor of the People's Independent Church of Christ at 18th and Paloma Streets.

Lindsay was, or was to become, a member there. (He was a People's Independent member when he died.) Rev. Russell greeted Hahn warmly, saying: "If Herbert is for you, I'm for you; and, if I'm for you, my church is for you."

Kenneth Hahn and Gilbert Lindsay were closely associated in politics and personal lives until Lindsay's death.

"Without his help," Hahn said, "I would not have been elected to the Board of Supervisors in 1952."

Lindsay was the associate manager of Hahn's 1952 campaign.

Kenneth Hahn also received substantial help in his political campaigns from the Women's Sunday Morning Breakfast Club, which was founded by Lindsay's wife, Mrs. Theresa Lindsay.

Gil Lindsay was quite proud of the fact that the Women's Sunday Morning Breakfast Club gave 24 full scholarships to college students and purchased five Life Memberships in the NAACP. Lindsay was a member of the NAACP's board of directors from 1953-58 and also was a vice-president of that organization.

Lindsay first made national Black political history when he was appointed as a deputy to Supervisor Hahn. After 10 years in that position, Lindsay was appointed in January, 1963, to fill the vacant Ninth District City Council seat, becoming, as Rick Orlov said in the Daily News, "the first Black to sit in one of the 15 high-backed leather chairs around the ornate council horseshoe." Lindsay replaced Edward Roybal, who had been elected to Congress.

Gil Lindsay stood only five feet, three inches tall. But, he felt like a giant of man after he made his way up from being a janitor to being a Los Angeles city councilman, and the first member of his race to do it, too. A few months later, Tom Bradley became the first Black elected member of the Los Angeles City Council. The other day, Bradley said he and Lindsay remained friends for 27 years.

In 1965, Lindsay was elected to the Los Angeles City Council in his own right, and went on to win six re-elections in the ninth district.

"Gil Lindsay was one of the few politicians who never ran for anything else," said his deputy, Bob Gay, who first went to work for him as a volunteer. "He really loved that district and that job."

When Lindsay last ran for reelection at age 89 in 1989, he received 73 percent of the Ninth District vote!

While recalling his appointment to the Los Angeles City Council in 1963, Lindsay once said:

"I helped everybody get elected around here—presidents, governors. I thought I should do something for myself."

"His ability to talk to virtually anybody, from the guys at the shoeshine stand to the corporate executive deeply impressed me," Gay said. "Gil Lindsay had a sensitivity to the average person. He loved young people; he loved senior citizens. He was open. His door was always open. He supported every good cause. He was exceptionally and intensely loyal."

He received loyalty in return from his employees, one of whom, Irene Matsubara, worked 27 years for him.

"I found him to be a very outgoing individual," said Dr. Josie Bain, who for seven or eight years was the program coordinator of the Women's Sunday Morning Breakfast Club. "He liked attention and wore it well. He was very interested in helping almost anyone in need. He would reach far beyond that which would be normally expected."

"He was proud of himself and rightfully so, knowing that he had come from the cotton fields of Mississippi. Such a background and such an achievement made him a very proud individual."

Businessman Celes King III, who came to Los Angeles with his family in 1936, knew Gilbert Lindsay most of his (King's) life.

"Los Angeles and America have lost one of the great community legislators," King said. "He had possibly more impact on more people than any other local politician."

"I can remember as a kid when I was sitting as an altar boy in the People's Independent Church and Gil Lindsay would read the announcements each Sunday. He is the person who took the younger members of the church and gave us a sense of direction."

"He made it clear that we must be accountable and we must be successful. He gave us a type of pride that carried many of us through."

James M. Woods, Sr., is another highly successful, Los Angeles businessman who knew Lindsay well.

"From time to time," Woods said, "we were very close. Once, when he was sick, I wanted to go to see him. Someone told me, 'You can't see him.' I said, 'Let me walk into the room.' Just as I walked in, he raised his head and said, 'Hello, Jim.'"

"He put a lot back into the community. He changed the whole downtown area. People stayed on and didn't move out. He gave the people confidence. He was interested in his people. I think he'll be greatly missed."

Gilbert Lindsay's son, Melvin, died last year. Theresa, his wife of 49 years, died in 1984. He is survived by a daughter, Sylvia Thornton, who lives in Chicago, and stepson Herbert.

"Theresa Lindsay was a balance in his life," Howard said.

A family friend said:

"I believe Gil Lindsay began to decline mentally and physically after Theresa died."

Funeral services for Lindsay will be held at 10 a.m., on Friday, January 4, in the Victory Baptist Church, 4802 South McKinley Avenue, Los Angeles.

Victory Baptist is pastored by Rev. Charles Chapman, who once worked for Lindsay. The funeral is being held there because its auditorium is larger than the one in People's Independent Church of Christ. People's minister, Rev. William Naylor, will officiate at the funeral.

John Ferraro said:

"Anyone who knew Gil Lindsay and didn't love him—there had to be something wrong with them."

OPERATION DESERT STORM

HON. ROBERT J. MRAZEK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1991

Mr. MRAZEK. Mr. Speaker, it is time for the Congress and the country to unite. War is the greatest test not only of a soldier's physical and mental resilience, but also of a nation's. We will be most successful in this war if we are united in our support for the President's objective of ousting Saddam Hussein's forces from Kuwait, and united in our support for the courageous men and women fighting in the Persian Gulf.

Those men and women—who are risking their lives and making the greatest sacrifice possible simply because their country has asked them to—are deserving of our highest praise and admiration. I urge every Member of Congress and every American citizen to offer

their full support, and their prayers, for those taking part in Operation Desert Storm.

Early battle reports, which are notoriously unreliable, are nevertheless very encouraging. This air campaign has obviously been extraordinarily well-planned and apparently well-executed.

It is the fervent hope of us all that it will be enough; that the war will be over quickly and with a minimum loss of blood and treasure; and that the further destruction of Iraq and a deadly ground war can be avoided. But it now depends on Saddam Hussein. He must come to his senses and act in a rational manner and remove his forces from Kuwait. It is the only path to peace.

EDITORIAL REFLECTS NATIONAL UNITY AND RESOLVE

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1991

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the mood of the entire country seems to be somber but relieved on the morning after the beginning of Operation Desert Storm.

That double-edged mood is reflected in much of the editorial remarks in the Nation's newspapers. Typical editorials lament the failed diplomatic efforts and acknowledge the fact that Saddam Hussein has left us no other alternative but that of removing him by force from Kuwait. There also seems to be a national determination to do what's necessary, do it right, do it quickly, and bring our forces home. There is resolve, but no gloating. Relief over the unexpected success of initial attacks is tempered with a sober realization that this war is not over, and that Saddam Hussein is a resourceful as well as a brutal foe.

I place in today's RECORD a good example of that balanced editorial comment, a Thursday morning editorial in the Albany Times-Union. I would urge all members to read it.

[From the Times Union, Albany, NY., Jan. 17, 1991]

A BATTLE FOR KUWAIT, AND PEACE

The fighting that no American wanted, and all wished would never come, is now a part of history in the making. Sadly, it comes as no surprise. The last hopes for peace had faded with the collapse of a midnight-hour attempt at diplomacy by the French. Iraq's Saddam Hussein, arrogant as ever, refused to yield the Kuwait his forces had captured in August.

The battle has been joined, President Bush told the nation in a televised address Wednesday night. It's a confrontation that Saddam Hussein refused to avoid, and cannot be allowed to win. Nothing would bring him to his senses—not world condemnation, not economic sanctions, not warnings from President Bush or resolutions from the United Nations or the U.S. Congress. Nothing. Now the last method of persuasion is at hand, with all the pain and death that will mean for all involved.

Let no one mistake: This is a war Saddam Hussein brought upon himself. He scorned one attempt after another to find a peaceful solution. He was defiant even up to the last moment, as Iraqi forces began to move chemical weaponry closer to allied forces

massed in Saudi Arabia. He was unresponsive to one entreaty after another.

There were numerous opportunities to respond. All were rebuffed, including concessions for a conference on Middle Eastern issues, United Nations Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar made one such offer, the French another proposal. Even the White House softened, while resolutely, and properly, refusing to link Iraq's aggression in Kuwait with the Palestinian issue.

With war upon us, some clear priorities need to be stated. One is to wage battle as forcibly as necessary to bring this confrontation to a quick resolution. Another is to hold casualties on both sides to a minimum, although the primary concern must be the American and allied service personnel who have placed their lives at risk.

The latter goal can't be achieved if political support weakens, as it did during the Vietnam war. Saddam Hussein is a student of that war, as well as the American Marine presence in Lebanon. Both chapters have led him to scorn American resolve in the face of casualties, while boasting of Iraqi courage. Both have given him a distorted confidence that Americans will soon tire of this conflict and retreat.

President Bush, mindful of Saddam Hussein's penchant for gross miscalculation, vows that no American or allied soldier will be asked to fight with one hand tied. That, too, must be a priority concern, along with removing Saddam Hussein from the world scene. Victory will come not only when Iraq's army is forced out of Kuwait, but also when Saddam is stripped of power.

Whether a long war or a short one, there will be a high price to pay in human life. Yet the cost has to be weighed against the much higher toll that surely would have been exacted had Saddam Hussein managed to build a nuclear arsenal. Civilized nations cannot abide vainglorious despots who would menace the world with weapons of annihilation.

TRIBUTE TO DR. DEMIE MAINIERI

HON. ILEANA A. ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1991

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to pay tribute to an outstanding resident in my congressional district, Dr. Demie Mainieri. After 31 years of dedicated service as associate dean, athletic director and head baseball coach at the Miami Dade Community College, north campus, Dr. Mainieri is retiring.

Throughout his career, Dr. Demie Mainieri has distinguished himself as an educator, coach, administrator, and community leader as well as a major contributor to amateur baseball on the local, national, and international level. Dr. Mainieri has received numerous accolades resulting in his induction into the American Baseball Coaches' Hall of Fame, National Junior College Athletics Association Hall of Fame, Potomac State College Athletic Hall of Fame, and the West Virginia University Physical Education Hall of Fame.

Coach Demie Mainieri's Falcon baseball teams have won numerous championships at the State, regional, and national level. Coach Demie Mainieri is the first junior college baseball coach to ever record 1,000 coaching vic-

tories, finishing a prestigious career with 1,012 wins. Twenty-three former Miami Dade north players under Coach Mainieri's tutelage have had successful careers in major league baseball. More than 90 of Coach Demie Mainieri's former Falcon players have been drafted by professional baseball teams. Dr. Mainieri established a nationally acclaimed sports program for inner city youths and provided leadership for the training and development of over 500 recreational leaders.

Over the years, Dr. Mainieri has been honored by several organizations including a "Man of the Year Award" from the Italian American Foundation.

In honor of his service, a banquet will be held at the Radisson Mart Plaza Hotel on February 22. I commend the works of State Senator Carrie Meek, Dr. Mary Mahan, Ron Warnock, Jay Rokeach, Kathi Hanson, Bill Alheim, Mary Dagraedt, John Takovich, and Tom Prescott for putting this reception together.

Dr. Mainieri is certainly deserving of this recognition, for he has had significant accomplishments in community college athletics and a positive impact on thousands of south Floridians.

SUPPORTING THE HAMILTON/ GEPHARDT RESOLUTION

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1991

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, first, I would like to extend congratulations to my colleague, LEE HAMILTON. Not only has the gentleman from Indiana been my friend, but our districts adjoin across the Ohio River, and so I have had the opportunity to observe his performance for many years. I am now happy that the merit that we knew he had, but was somewhat hidden under the bushel basket, is now for the entire country and the world to view because he is certainly bringing great dignity to this debate.

I would like to extend congratulations to the majority leader, who has shown his leadership on this issue, as well as the budget issue last autumn; Speaker FOLEY, because it is Speaker FOLEY who showed the courage and the tenacity to bring that issue up as it ought to be brought up; and certainly last, but not least, the President of the United States, who has these tremendous and weighty burdens on his shoulders which all of us join in praying God that they be discharged in a way that will bring the situation in the Mideast to a speedy and, we hope, peaceful conclusion.

I think there are some postulates that ought to be talked about here as we get the debate started. One is that all Members—whichever resolution of the three before us that Members would support—are serious and have approached this with a great deal of thoughtfulness.

As one who has served in this body for over 20 years and having observed the debate for the last day or two, I think this is really going to be one of the high points of congressional service for all of us.

I think another postulate is that Saddam Hussein is a vile, mean, and evil man who ought not to be condoned in any fashion by any civilized nation of the world. I think I ought to say, as a veteran of the U.S. Army, back in the 1950's, that I believe wars need to be fought from time to time, that they are not totally avoidable. My belief is that this one ought not to be fought now, but I believe many of us approach on the premise not that all wars are bad but that this war may not be necessary now.

Whatever is voted up at the end of the debate on the day after tomorrow, I think it is our responsibility as Members of the House to support the men and women in Operation Desert Shield, to be sure they have the material and all the support necessary to carry out their function.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of the gentleman's resolution. I intend, also, to support the resolution of our friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT], which I think establishes correctly that the real power to declare war is vested in article I, section VIII of the Constitution, in the Congress, and not the President.

But the Hamilton-Gephardt resolution is a stay-the-course resolution. It allows that the sanctions currently in place be continued, and that those sanctions be tightened. It makes sure that all the diplomatic efforts which are underway are continued and strengthened. It keeps the forces we have in place so that they would be available to thwart any attack or to mount an offensive action if that is demand necessary and voted up by the body at some time in the future.

However, unlike the Solarz-Michel resolution, this one before us does not give the President a blank check or a carte blanche authority to take an offensive action.

I have to ask these very simple questions, Mr. Speaker. Why would we need to go to war right now or at midnight on Monday night, the beginning of January 15? The President's objectives have largely been realized. Our hostages have been returned. The oil supplies are protected. Neither Saudi Arabia nor any other nation in the area is threatened. The area is stabilized.

The two other things the President desires to be done, that Kuwait be rid of Saddam Hussein and his forces, and that the Sabah family be returned to the throne in Kuwait, I do not think are needed at this actual moment in time—needed eventually, but not right now needed enough to warrant going to war.

I hear so much about this fragile coalition which might fall apart unless a war is fought at midnight Monday night or soon thereafter. If the coalition is that fragile, then maybe it is not really a coalition except in name only.

Many of the members of the coalition are not paying the money they pledged. Many of the members of the coalition are not sending their men and certainly not their women into this fight. So what is the coalition? Maybe that coalition is not really one anyway, and so it should not be the determining factor of whether we send our men and women to a sure death, in some cases, in order to preserve this coalition.

I liken this to: "We will hold your coat while you do the fighting." That is what this is.

There are a number of nations in the so-called coalition that said, "Hey, we will hold your coat, but we want you guys to do the fighting, and we then want you to pay for the fighting." They have not ponied up the money. They are not going to. They do not send us their troops, and they are not going to. But they want the benefits of our war. I do not think that is fair. I do not think that is something this House and this Congress ought to do.

The whole idea is to demonize Saddam Hussein and deify Kuwait. Kuwait: We hear so much about Kuwait. We have got to restore the Al Sabah family; this is a great nation that has been run over by an aggressor.

I will sum up by saying that Kuwait is a feudal dictatorship, a feudal kingdom. Its people do not vote. The majority of the people who lived within the bounds of Kuwait before the takeover were not even Kuwaiti citizens. They were guestworkers or U.S. people who were there doing work for the oil companies.

The fact of the matter is there is nothing free and democratic. There is nothing devoted to human civil rights in the nation of Kuwait. Why, pray tell, should we sacrifice ourselves and our future to restore that?

Mr. Speaker, I think what we ought to do is continue the sanctions, make sure they do not leak, make sure these members of the coalition who are knowingly allowing these leaks to take place do not take those actions, and then let us see what happens.

If later down the road we have to take offensive action, we will do so. We should do it. But, it ought not be done now at this point in time.

LEGISLATION TO PREVENT SWEETHEART DEALS BETWEEN THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE AND CONCESSIONAIRES

HON. FRANK J. GUARINI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1991

Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, I am reintroducing legislation today that will prevent future sweetheart deals between the National Park Service and concessionaires and give the Secretary of Interior the authority to terminate existing contracts if they are owned or controlled by foreign interests.

In 1965, the Concessions Policy Act was created to provide incentives for businesses to build and operate concessions in our national parks. The act directs the Secretary of Interior to " * * * encourage continuity of operation and facilities by giving preference in the renewal of contracts or permits to the concessionaires who have performed satisfactorily. * * * " According to a 1980 GAO report, Congress should repeal this provision because " * * * existing concessionaires already have a competitive advantage over others who want to operate in the parks—they do not need additional legal advantages."

The GAO also recommended that Congress eliminate the provision of the act which cites that a concessionaire has a possessory interest in the structures, fixtures, or improvements

that it acquires or constructs. In order for the Park Service to terminate a contract, they must reimburse the concessionaire an amount equal to reconstruction costs less depreciation. In some cases, concessionaires have over \$200 million of possessory interests invested at the national park. This makes it virtually impossible to compete for a new contract and discourages potential competitors from even bidding on it.

The recent Matsushita takeover of MCA, which operates the concessions at the Yosemite National Park, has raised serious questions about how and why MCA was able to maintain a monopoly that generates over \$75 million in annual revenues while paying less than \$600,000 back to the Federal Government. The Secretary, to his credit, acted quickly to resolve an embarrassing situation and had already publicly announced his intention in July to put a new concessions policy in place.

However, this can only be accomplished by repealing the two unnecessary provisions of the law—preferential rights and possessory interest. My legislation repeals these clauses and requires the Secretary of Interior to develop and implement a new system within 90 days for the renewal and extension of existing contracts and permits, the granting of new contracts and permits, and providing new or additional services through concessionaires in areas of the National Park System. This new system must secure competitive bids and advertising for concessions contracts and to the extent possible, limit the term of these contracts to 5 years.

Further, my bill would require the Secretary to review existing contracts, many of which are sweetheart deals, to determine if any of these contracts are owned or controlled by foreign interests or if any contracts were awarded outside of the normal Park Service procedures and if so, whether or not the contract can be terminated on that basis.

The Secretary is also required to provide access to Ellis Island by way of a bridge connecting Liberty State Park and Ellis Island. The working families of America deserve free and easy access to one of our greatest national monuments.

Finally, I have requested that the Secretary review the concession serving the Statue of Liberty and Ellis Island to determine if there is sufficient access for the public and if the cost of the ferry service to these national monuments is justified. The concessionaire virtually doubled its rate to the islands, limiting the access to the millions of people expected to visit this year.

HOW WE'LL KNOW WE'VE WON

HON. TONY P. HALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1991

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, 1 week ago, I addressed the House to express my misgivings about the impending threat of a war in the Persian Gulf. In the absence of clear military and international objectives, I wondered, how would the United States know when we had achieved those objectives; how

would we know when the war was over? Second, I expressed my sadness that, while we seem to have the will to fight, we do not have the heart for the poor and hungry.

I was pleased, therefore, to read this morning's Washington Post, which contained a column by David Broder entitled "How We'll Know We've Won," which sets out some long-term goals. I was particularly pleased to note that the final goal would be for the administration to address the problems of hunger and homelessness in this country. Clearly, Mr. Broder understands that a victory overseas is empty if it comes at the expense of needy American men, women, and children.

For the benefit of my colleagues, a copy of the article follows:

HOW WE'LL KNOW WE'VE WON

(By David S. Broder)

On Wednesday afternoon, two hours before the outbreak of hostilities in the Persian Gulf, Chuck Skaggs, 22, of Dale City, Va., finished up his paperwork at the Army recruiting office in Woodbridge, Va. A third-generation construction worker, whose grandfather had served in World War II and whose father had served in the '60s, Skaggs was absolutely clear on why he had just asked for "front-line combat infantry" training.

"I have always been taught, 'Defend your country at all costs,'" he said. "And if we can't help other people keep their freedom, what good are we?"

Skaggs' old-fashioned patriotism was very much on my mind as I walked to work later that night past posters reading, "Stop Bush's War Now."

Of course, the instant hostilities started, it stopped being "Bush's War" and became a cause to which the overwhelming majority of Americans instinctively rallied. After days and nights of tension during the countdown to the Jan. 15 deadline for Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait, there was relief from the growing sense of frustration with the diplomatic "stiff-arm" Saddam Hussein had given to all proposals for a peaceful solution.

Just as oil prices dropped, instead of rising, on the news of war, American spirits rose, instead of sagging. An ABC News-Washington Post poll showed three out of four people approving the president's decision to delay no longer on the resort to force. The patriotic impulse was enhanced by the upbeat tone of the first Pentagon news briefings.

Welcome as that surge of emotion has been, reason cautions that harder times lie ahead—and sterner tests for this nation's leadership.

Military strategists always assumed we could win the air war decisively. From all indications, that confidence was justified. But it will be several days at least until we know if the bombs and missiles have been effective enough to spare the allied armies in Saudi Arabia from the bloody task of uprooting the Iraqi forces entrenched in captured Kuwait. The attack on Israel last night threatens a wider war.

Each additional day of fighting will add to the controversy about the definition of "victory" for the anti-Saddam coalition. While Bush set the objective simply as the liberation of Kuwait and expressed the hope that "Iraq will live as a peaceful and cooperative member of the family of nations," it is by no means clear whether the forces in battle will tolerate Saddam Hussein's remaining in power.

Already, strong voices among American conservatives and supporters of Israel are arguing that it would be a travesty if he were allowed to salvage even a psychological victory as the ruler of Baghdad. But the overthrow of Saddam implies a conquest of Iraq—a task the United Nations has never sanctioned and one which could entail far heavier casualties.

Beyond that, the question of a new strategic balance in the Middle East remains largely unaddressed. And so does the impact of this war on what Bush has called the "New World Order."

His Wednesday night Oval Office address was a disappointment, even to those of us who strongly agree with the president that the world could not tolerate naked aggression in an area as vital as the Gulf by a dictator with Saddam's ambition and arsenal.

The Bush speech was backward-looking a rehash of the argument he already had won against those in Congress and the country who had, in good conscience, urged him to continue to rely on economic sanctions to bring Saddam to heel. It did little to clarify how and when we would consider the military action complete—and what we want to see afterward.

Assuming that the armed forces of America and its allies do their job, the president and his administration will ultimately be judged on how well they fulfill three missions only they can perform:

First, they must lead in creating a stable balance of power in the Persian Gulf, dominated by nations less objectionable than Iran or our crypto-ally-for-the-moment, Syria, and secured by something other than a permanent and massive U.S. military presence in the region. And they must lead in addressing the too long postponed question of reconciling Palestinian rights with Israel's security.

Second, they must bring that wonderful concept of "New World Order" down to Earth before it is defined by political opponents in ways they would not like. Where do those economic powerhouses of Japan and Germany so conspicuously on the sidelines in this struggle, fit into the NWO? How does Bush intend to induce them to play their part? That question must be answered, or Americans will be left thinking that our troops are the cops the world can summon whenever anyone is in a jam. And how about the Soviet Union? How long can we pretend not to see the increasing brutality of its internal policies?

Finally, the president and his administration must show their understanding of the American people's priorities by shifting as quickly as possible from targeting ammunition dumps and antiaircraft batteries to focusing on the evil here at home of hunger and homelessness, crime and drugs, illiteracy and disease.

The patriotism of a Chuck Skaggs and the sacrifices being made on the battlefields of the Middle East demand no less.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE REOPENING OF UNIVERSITIES ON THE WEST BANK AND GAZA

HON. NICK JOE RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1991

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce a concurrent resolution calling upon the Israeli Government to reopen the universities which have been closed under military order for more than 3 years, located in the occupied territories of the West Bank and Gaza.

In past years, until his recent retirement, our distinguished colleague Howard Neilson, had taken on himself the responsibility and duty to introduce such resolutions, expressing the sense of the Congress that these six universities be reopened, giving Palestinian students the opportunity to return to their careers in higher education. As it now stands, and as it has stood for 3 years, tens of thousands of university students and high school graduates have been cut off from any chance to pursue professional education and training.

Palestinians, very much like Israelis, have long taken pride in being the most educated group in the Arab world. The institutions that have been closed, most of which were established in 1971, are supported by student fees/tuition, and private contributions and gifts. They do not now and have never received financial support from the Israeli Government. The parents of these Arab children deeply deplore the lost opportunities their children are suffering, because they place high value on education, and have a history of sacrificing much to educate their children. In other words, Palestinians are like Americans and Israelis, all of whom place a high value on education as a basic right.

Concern for the universities is shared by many. For example, last year, a group of more than 400 Israeli academics held a press conference at Hebrew University, petitioning the Defense Ministry to reopen the schools. An all-day teach-in was held at Tel Aviv University in solidarity with the closed Palestinian universities.

Here in the United States, over 200 faculty and 800 students at Harvard and MIT signed a petition calling for the immediate reopening of the universities. Open letters to Congress, representing 30 American Jewish educators and scholars in the field of Jewish studies, have been received in support of past congressional resolutions calling for the reopening of the universities.

The United States Government has pressed repeatedly for universities to be reopened, according to congressional testimony by Assistant Secretary of State Richard Schifter given last May at a joint hearing of the Europe and Middle East Subcommittee and the Human Rights and International Organizations Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud recent events that have seen the Israeli Government reopen all elementary and secondary schools in both the West Bank and Gaza, along with many of the community colleges. Of equal note is the fact

that since April 1990, Israel has reopened a portion of Al Quds, and just this past August allowed Bethlehem University to reopen. While this is more than a welcome sign, the rest of Al Quds and four other universities remain closed, including the Islamic University in Gaza.

Last year, House Concurrent Resolution 315, which commended the Israelis for steps already taken to reopen some schools, and urged them to continue the process, had a total of 82 cosponsors, as well as the support of the administration. Also last year, both the House and Senate passed amendments to foreign aid bills, again commending Israel's decision to open the two schools on the West Bank, and urging that the remaining universities be reopened as quickly as possible.

It is obvious that reopening all the universities on the West Bank and Gaza would make an important contribution to improving relations between Palestinians and the Government of Israel and the pursuit of peace in the region, as well as to improve trade relations between the European Community and Israel.

For this and many reasons, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this concurrent resolution, so that these institutions of learning, of such grave importance to the future of Palestinian youth, be reopened and remain open, and be regarded and respected by all parties as places of learning, and not be made the scapegoat of unrest created by the Intifadah.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues the words contained in the open letter to Congress, written by 30 American Jewish educators and scholars:

*** to deprive a population of education this way is to impose a form of collective punishment on an entire society. This is not the way to move toward peace. Such steps only serve to embitter the Palestinians; a lasting peace will require that the two peoples treat each other with mutual respect. We urge you to call on Israel to reopen the universities. We make this request both as friends of Israel and out [of] the respect for education which is central to Jewish traditions.

I sincerely request the attention of my colleagues to this resolution again during the 102d Congress, and ask their support in obtaining its passage. Education is, after all, a basic human right that ought to transcend politics. It has been found that there is no evidence that the official justification for the closures in the first place, which was said to be to quell unrest resulting from the Intifadah, has any basis in fact.

The normal functioning of the education system on the West Bank and in Gaza City is of deep interest to both sides, and it will certainly benefit both. I believe these young Palestinians would be far better off involved in getting an education, than wandering the streets of the West Bank and Gaza.

Support academic freedom. Reopen the Palestinian universities.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION CONCERNING TAX TREATMENT OF CERTAIN INTANGIBLE ASSETS

HON. BRIAN J. DONNELLY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1991

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today to clarify the tax treatment of corporate acquisitions of certain assets. This legislation is similar to legislation which the House of Representatives adopted in 1987, and I urge its adoption by Congress this year.

Under current law, the goodwill of a business is not depreciable or deductible as a business expense. Over the years, however, many taxpayers have attempted to claim that the costs of acquiring a customer list or other similar asset is separable from good will, and subject to depreciation. The Internal Revenue Service typically challenges such deductions, and in 1987, the Committee on Ways and Means adopted language as part of the budget to clarify that a customer list or similar asset was, essentially, goodwill.

Unfortunately, the Ways and Means Committee provision was deleted from the budget in conference with the Senate. Since that time, the IRS has lost several major court cases on this issue; the courts have, in many respects, carved out a road map for taxpayers to take advantage of this uncertainty in the tax laws. My legislation would end this debate once and for all. It would also end some outrageous positions taken by taxpayers which were reported last summer in *Forbes* magazine, including an attempt to depreciate a recipe for pizza crust.

Mr. Speaker, I insert a technical description of my legislation at this point in the RECORD.

TECHNICAL DESCRIPTION OF LEGISLATION PRESENT LAW

Taxpayers may claim depreciation on property used in a trade or business or for the production of income. Generally, a deduction for depreciation is available only if the property is a wasting asset or if the life of the property can be ascertained with reasonable accuracy.

In the case of intangible assets, depreciation is available only if the property has a limited useful life of more than one year and meets the trade or business or production of income test. However, no deduction for depreciation is allowable with respect to goodwill.

Some taxpayers take the position that, after a corporate acquisition, the costs of customer lists and other similar intangible assets are depreciable and separable from goodwill, generally on the grounds that such assets have a useful life that can be determined with reasonable certainty. Some recent court opinions seem to support this position (see, e.g., *Newark Morning Ledger v. U.S.*, 734 F.2d 176; *Citizens and Southern Corporation v. Commissioner*, 91 T.C. 463), although the Internal Revenue Service does not agree (see, e.g., Rev. Rul. 74-456, 1974-2 CB 65). The IRS will typically challenge claims that amounts paid for customer lists are separable from goodwill.

When a franchise, trademark, or trade-name is transferred, payments on account of

such transfer are allowed as an ordinary and necessary business deduction if they are contingent on the productivity, use, or disposition of the asset. If the transfer is not treated as a sale because the transferor retains any significant power, right, or continuing interest with respect to the subject matter of such asset, then any payment of a principal sum agreed upon in the transfer agreement is deductible over a period not exceeding 10 years (section 1253(d)(2) and (3)).

EXPLANATION OF PROPOSAL

The bill clarifies that any amount paid or incurred to acquire customer base, market share, or any renewing or similar intangible item is treated as paid or incurred for intangible property with an indeterminate useful life, and therefore is not amortizable or depreciable.

The items covered include, for example, customer and subscription lists; patient or other client records; the existing "core" deposits of banks; insurance in force in the case of an insurance company; advertising relationships and customer or circulation base in the case of a broadcast, cable, newspaper, cellular, or any other business; other contracts or relationships reflecting the value of the customer base; location advantage; workforce in place; and market share in the case of any business.

Finally, the bill is intended to clarify that section 1253(d)(2) or (3) does not apply to any payment made by the transferee of a franchise, trademark, or tradename to a transferor who does not retain any significant power, right, or continuing interest with respect to the subject matter of the franchise, trademark, or tradename. The fact that another party who is not the transferor may retain such a right thus does not permit the transferee to deduct any amount under section 1253(d)(2) or (3).

No inference is intended as to present law.

EFFECTIVE DATE

The legislation is effective for acquisitions after the date of enactment.

CHABAD WEEK

HON. ROBERT J. MRAZEK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1991

Mr. MRAZEK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of "Chabad Week", which was proclaimed from December 12-19, 1990 by the Chabad of Huntington.

The Chabad Lubavitch is a worldwide movement under the leadership of one of the most revered spiritual leaders, Rabbi Menachem Schneerson. This movement has for many years promoted a greater awareness of the concepts of education, morality, and decency among all peoples. The Chabad of Huntington is a vibrant and growing organization within this movement.

Chabad Week coincided with the celebration of Chanukah, a commemoration of the rededication of the Jewish temple by the Maccabaeus in 165 B.C. During this week, members of the Chabad of Huntington personally contacted every Jewish household, and also made visits to local hospitals, care homes, and jails. In addition, the Chabad conducted Menorah kindling ceremonies in major shopping centers and constructed Menorah

displays in local supermarkets and local town halls. The Chabad also sponsored a Chanukah mobile office offering information and gifts for children throughout the community.

Mr. Speaker, I praise the members of the Chabad of Huntington for their active civic participation. Not only did they make the Chanukah celebration in the Huntington area more festive, they helped to educate people from all walks of life about the significance of this ancient celebration of Chanukah. I wish the Chabad's members continued success in all of its endeavors.

ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINE INDEPENDENCE

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1991

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, January 22 will be a truly important and significant day for the people of Ukraine and their friends and relatives here and around the world. On that date 73 years ago, the Ukrainian National Republic severed Ukraine's ties with the rest of the former Russian Empire and declared the Ukrainian Nation's independence. While the anniversary of this event is marked by Ukrainians with honor and pride, it is also observed with sadness. Within 4 years of its independence, Ukraine was again subjugated to Russian control, this time under the ruthless fist of the Bolsheviks.

In past observances of this important occasion, I have spoken here on the floor of the House of Representatives about the history of the Ukrainian Nation and its past role in the European Community. Today I want to look to the future and to the possible role that Ukraine may at long last again play as an independent member of that community—if the United States and the free nations of Europe reach out and offer it a hand in doing so.

At this moment, Ukraine and the many other nations under the control of the Soviet Union stand at a crossroads. They may at last be able to escape the clutches of the only empire that survived the First World War—under the guise of a so-called progressive ideology. On the other hand, however, they may well be forced back under the control of that empire—to the detriment of not only their national and cultural independence, but to the cause of democracy in the Soviet Union as well.

Unfortunately, the belief held by many here in the free world that the success of Soviet democratic reforms depends on keeping Mikhail Gorbachev in power is increasing the likelihood that the second result will be obtained instead of the first. It is the mistaken belief of policy makers here in the United States and in Europe that by supporting the striving of Ukraine and the other captive nations to achieve their independence we are undermining Gorbachev and his effort to carry out those reforms.

The spin that Gorbachev puts on the portrayal of the Ukrainian and other nationalist movements to this captive audience in the West is obviously meant to reinforce that belief—because it serves his effort to stay in

power. The fact is that we shouldn't feel we have to choose between democratic reforms and freedom for Ukraine and the other captive nations. We instead need to choose both.

It is clear that today Ukraine and the other captive nations are nothing more than colonies for the Soviet Empire. In recent years, for example, Ukraine has provided an estimated 90 percent of its production to the central government in Moscow. In return, the Soviet system has paid it back with the long-term depletion of Ukraine's resources, and, most recently, the reactor explosion at Chernobyl that contaminated a large part of Ukraine's territory. The fact is that this colonization of Ukraine and the other captive nations of the Soviet Union has combined with the failed Communist economic system to literally sap their peoples of any desire to reinvigorate the Soviet system.

That is why Gorbachev has had to turn to the army and to the KGB to try to keep them in line. Gorbachev's continued description of himself as a "convinced Communist" and his continued proposal of unrealistic "constitutional" plans to keep Ukraine and the other nations under Soviet control shows that he is not facing facts. And the facts are that communism is a failure and the future of Europe must include freedom for these captive nations.

We here in the United States need to recognize these facts also. Economic prosperity and democratic reform in the Soviet Union are tied up with the question of nationalist self-determination. As long as Ukraine and the other captive nations are forced to remain under Soviet control—as long as they are not recognized by the United States and Europe as independent nations—neither democracy or prosperity will be achieved. Instead, we in the West will be asked to pour economic aid in to support the central Soviet Government—whose ideology and economic policies are outright failures with no chance of success.

I have long felt that what the peoples of the Soviet Union need most is not more aid, but more freedom. And that includes national freedom, which will provide newly liberated Ukrainians and other nations the incentives they want and need to rebuild their economies and invest in the future. I hope that the United States and its allies in Europe will take steps to establish more direct contacts with Ukraine and those other nations, recognize their recent declarations of sovereignty, and begin bringing them into the European Community.

On this, the 73d anniversary of the declaration of Ukrainian independence, the Ukrainian people have my best wishes for their future economic and political prosperity.

BIPRISA PARADE HONORS JOSE MARTI

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1991

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, on January 28, we will celebrate another anniversary of the birth of Jose Marti, the Cuban poet and national hero. The Bilingual Private Schools Association [Biprisa] will host the XVII Schools

Parade in the City of Miami which will honor the 138th anniversary of Jose Marti.

Born in 1853, Jose Marti was a man who valued both words and actions and he gave his life for freedom while fighting for Cuba's liberation from Spain. The following obituary was published in *The Sun* in New York City on May 23, 1895:

We learn with poignant sorrow of the death of Jose Marti, the well-known leader of the Cuban revolutionists. We knew him long and well, and esteemed him profoundly. For a protracted period, beginning twenty years ago, he was employed as a contributor to *The Sun*, writing on subjects and questions of the fine arts. In these things his learning was solid and extensive, and his ideas and conclusions were original and brilliant. He was a man of genius, of imagination, of hope, and of courage, one of these descendants of the Spanish race whose American birth and instincts seem to have added to the revolutionary tincture which all modern Spaniards inherit. His heart was warm and affectionate, his opinions ardent and aspiring, and he died as such a man might wish to die, battling for liberty and democracy. Of such heroes there are not too many in the world, and his warlike grave testifies that, even in a positive and material age, there are spirits that can give all for their principles without thinking of any selfish return for themselves.

Honor to the memory of Jose Marti, and peace to his manly and generous soul!

It is with great pride that we celebrate the birth of Jose Marti. He will live in our hearts forever.

For their part in the organization of the parade, I would like to commend the members of the board of directors of Biprisa: Demetrio Perez, Jr., Antonio Brito Munoz, Zoila Sanchez Cifuentes, Nerida Valdes, Alicia de la Torriente, Caridad Perez, Mario Beovides, Gil Beltran, and Rev. Martin Anorga. Their efforts in organizing the parade have been tremendous.

I would also like to recognize the participating schools and their directors: Nuria Milanes of Arrowhead Kindergarten, Mario Beovides of Jose Marti School, Alicia de la Torriente of Highpoint Academy, Caridad Perez of Edison Private School, Rev. Martin Anorga of La Progresiva Presbyterian, Zoila Sanchez Cifuentes of Sunny Day School, Gil Beltran of La Luz School, Antonio Brito Munoz of Brito Miami Private School, Moravia Capo of Inter-American Military Academy, Demetrio Perez, Jr. of Lincoln-Marti School, Maria Elena Lozano of Seven Dwarfs Nursery School, and Miriam Morales of Roston Academy.

Also included are Vivian Gutierrez of Columbus Military Academy, Fernando Villamor of St. Agatha Catholic School, Dr. Maria Alonso of Champagnat Catholic School, Marta Vega of Hialeah Institute, Jose Vila of Cinderealla Nursery School, Nerida Valdes of Christ-Mar School, Alina Santos of Roblanca Academy, Toddler University, Inc., Holy Family Catholic School, Teresita Baldor of Baldor Schools, and Dr. Olga Farinas of El Savior Academy.

Other members of Biprisa include Aleida Machado of Aleida's Nursery, Maria de los A. Perez, Lincoln-Marti Day Care, Miriam Morales of Garces Commercial College, Octavio Oliu of Gingerbread House, Milagros Montero of Panamerican Institute, and Nancy Guillermo of Nancy's Land.

UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE CARDINALS: 1991 FIESTA BOWL CHAMPS

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1991

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the University of Louisville football Cardinals on their 34 to 7 victory over the University of Alabama Crimson Tide in the 1991 Fiesta Bowl.

Led by head coach, Howard Schnellenberger, the football Cardinals have come a long way during the past 5 years. To illustrate, the 1991 Fiesta Bowl was the university's first bowl appearance in 13 years and its first major bowl appearance ever.

When Coach Schnellenberger came to Louisville to take the helm at University of Louisville—after a very successful career as a player and as a coach both in collegiate and professional ranks—Howard was coming back home.

He is a native Louisvillian, who played his high school football at Louisville Flaget High School. Coach Schnellenberger played his collegiate football at the University of Kentucky—ironically, under the legendary Paul (Bear) Bryant who led Alabama to greatness. So, Howard learned his coaching skills quite literally, at the master's knee.

To turn the Louisville program around, Coach Schnellenberger demanded much from his players and his staff. For those who chose to stay and be a part of his rebuilding program, the Fiesta Bowl victory was a sweet reward indeed.

A coach cannot, however, do it all. He needs a complement of players, assistants, coaches, trainers, managers, academic advisors, and the coach needs support from the student body and administration. Coach Schnellenberger enjoyed all these ingredients at University of Louisville—and then some—this season. And the university, not accidentally, achieved its best football record ever (10-1-1), and its highest Associated Press ranking ever; 14th.

Mr. Speaker, the Louisville community is still cheering about this notable Fiesta Bowl victory. I congratulate all who made this win possible, and I commend to the attention of my colleagues, the players, coaches, trainers, and officials—including university president, Donald Swain and athletic director, Bill Olsen—who made it all happen.

FIESTA BOWL

PLAYERS

John Tuyo, Randy Wyatt, Eric Broomfield, Klaus Wilmsmeyer, Anthony Cumming, Rawle Bynoe, Browning Nagle, Adrian Green, Greg Minnis, Robert Knuutila, Jeff Brohm, Andrew Cornell.

Erik Watts, Liggett Butler, Lito Mason, Kevin Gaines, Rhonyia Quick, Curtis Lipsey, Ralph Dawkins, Chris Fitzpatrick, William Blackford, John Gainey, Shawn Jackson, Rene Couto.

Pete Bynm, David Moyler, Teronnie Holmes, Bobby Hall, Latrell Ware, Ray Buchanan, Marcus Hill, Ben Sumpter, Joey Smith, Ron Bell, Ricky McFadden, Terry Quinn.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

1919

Tom Cavallo, Jim Simatacolos, Ed Reynolds, Merle Gardner, Derek Hawthorne, Paul McDowell, Pat Fitzgerald, Mark Sander, Ivey Henderson, Anwar Bell, Jerry Clarke, Brevin Smith.

Deron Williams, Reggie Johnson, Brian Hayes, Mel Mills, Carey Figg, Mike Nelson, Matt Johnson, James Lobitz, Dave Debold, Andy Culley, Darryl Swafford, John Bock.

Chris Hampton, Frank Perrotti, Billy Bosworth, Kevin Blumeier, Stephen Henchy, Jerry Crafts, Pete Burke, Garin Patrick, Mike Ivory, Tom Carroll, Scott McAllister, Shawn Rodriguez.

Ken McKay, Brandon Brookfield, Zoe Barney, Joe Johnson, Anthony Semak, Kedall Brown, Chris Young, Jose Gonzalez, Fred Jones, Greg Brohm, Dave Dubois, Dan Gangwer.

Tom Triplett, Jim Hanna, Mike Flores, Leonard Ray, Ron German, Ted Washington, Len Jacobson, Willie Haynes, Danny Hurd, Brad Wendling, Bill Logan, Chris Collins.

Jeff Roberts, Curt Cromwell, Kevin Cook, Michael Neely, Matt Slyter, Eric Carter, Deral Boykin, Alan McClure.

ADMINISTRATION OFFICIALS

Donald Swain, Ray Nystrand, Burt Monroe, Bill Olsen, Dick Hill, Keith Inman, Rob Brawner, Betty Jackson, Kenny Klein, Kevin Miller, Jeff Schneider, Mike Batuello, Ron Padgett, Jack Tennant.

COACHES

Howard Schnellenberger, Brad Bradford, Danny Hope, Rick Lantz, Bob Maddox, Jeff Morrow, Gary Nord, Ty Smith, Trent Walters, Christ Vagotis, Ron Steiner, Kevin Beck, Randy Whitt, Kurt Beathard.

Jeff Carlberg, Jay Gruden, Craig Swabek, Tom Andrews, Terry Lantz, Clark Wood, Ray Ganong, Ed Ruscher, Mike Schnurr, Matt Axline, Jeff Lucas, Jamie Yancher, Stewart Schnellenberger, Joe Nolder, T.J. Poelking.

TRAINERS

Mike O'Shea, Mike Palmisano, Raymond Shea, Chris Furr, Brad Anderson, Todd Beard, Mark Shepherd.

SECRETARIES

Michelle Cox, Pam Serotte, Donna O'Donnell, Deanna Curry, Denise Murphy, Laura Czerwonka.

MANAGERS

Jim McGhee, Paul Barker, Glenn Thompson, Steve Beswick, Steve Bruner, Walter Rhodes, Kevin Chinn, Albert Farmer, Homer Holland.

TAX INCENTIVES FOR THE USE OF MASS TRANSIT FACILITIES

HON. FRANK J. GUARINI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1991

Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which will eliminate a bias in the Tax Code against mass transit and make our environmental and transportation policies more rational.

Under current law an employee may receive unlimited free parking from his employer as a tax free fringe benefit. In some cities, this benefit is worth as much as \$4,800 per year. Conversely, since the 1986 Tax Reform Act, employers cannot provide tax-free vanpool services. Nor can an employee receive tax-free more than \$15 per month in mass transit benefits.

My legislation does not seek to change the tax treatment of employer-provided parking. It does, however, seek to place mass transit on a more equal footing with cars by excluding the value of vanpooling and up to \$60 per month in mass transit benefits completely from the employee's gross income. It also makes it as easy as possible for employers to offer this benefit by not requiring them to do so pursuant to a written plan. Less paperwork will encourage employers to offer mass transit benefits.

Using the Tax Code to encourage mass transit makes sense. Even though we have just enacted the first revisions to the Clean Air Act in over a decade, much work needs to be done to implement this legislation. Automobiles emit large portions of carbon monoxide and ozone which pollute our air. Reducing their use will produce substantial environmental benefits.

Urban areas such as Hudson County, NJ, my home district, are especially vulnerable to automobile pollution. In the New York City-New Jersey metropolitan area, 90 percent of the carbon monoxide and 50 percent of the ozone fouling the air can be traced to automobile exhaust. Anything we can do to reduce automobile traffic will help our environment. Not to mention the incredible congestion that plagues our highways and turnpikes.

This legislation has three basic components. First, it provides that when an employer provides vanpool services to its employees, the value of the vanpool is not included in the employee's gross income. Prior to the 1986 Tax Reform Act, vanpool benefits were excluded from gross income.

Second, if an employer provides its employees with transit passes or vouchers as a fringe benefit, the employee may exclude from gross income up to \$60 per month in such benefits, a four-fold increase from the current level of \$15 per month. Forty-six rides, essentially a monthly pass, on the PATH costs \$40, all of which would be covered by this benefit.

Increasing the exemption from gross income will make a significant difference, not just to the commuters, but to encouraging the use of mass transit generally. A 1984 survey conducted by the New York-New Jersey Port Authority suggests that as many as 26 percent of automobile commuters would switch to mass transit if they were given a subsidy.

This would mean thousands of fewer cars on the road throughout the country and my district, which is part of the traffic-clogged New York-New Jersey metropolitan area. Indeed, if we could reduce the number of drivers using the Lincoln and Holland tunnels by 10 to 15 percent, traffic delays during peak periods would drop by two-thirds, from 45 minutes to just 15 minutes.

To achieve this goal, we would have to encourage employers to provide this type of subsidy. The New York-New Jersey Port Authority, the Metropolitan Transit Authority and New Jersey Transit created TransitCenter in 1986, a public-private alliance to promote transit. TransitCenter developed the first regional transit voucher, called TransitChek, which was offered to area employers, who then could distribute this voucher to their employees as a fringe benefit.

Since 1987 about 1,200 companies have joined the TransitChek program, distributing mass transit vouchers to more than 25,000 of their employees. This is impressive, but undoubtedly, the \$15 limit seriously reduces participation. Increasing it beyond this de minimus amount can be expected to greatly enhance employer participation in this program and others like it throughout the country.

Even with this increased subsidy, the disparity between automobiles and mass transit remains significant. For example, in New York City the average cost for parking is \$192 per month; in Boston, \$245; in Los Angeles, \$120. Increasing mass transit benefits to \$60 per month is hardly unfair or rash under these circumstances.

Third, the legislation removes what is known as the "cliff" effect from our current tax law. At present, if an employee receives \$16 per month in mass transit benefits, just \$1 more than the allowable amount, the entire \$16 becomes taxable. Under my proposal, if an employee received \$61 in benefits, only \$1 would be taxable, not the entire amount.

This legislation will reduce the tax bias against mass transit, make mass transit more affordable, and therefore encourage its use. The environmental and transportation benefits of such an outcome would seem obvious. It is well past time that we start providing better tax treatment for mass transit.

OUTRAGED AT IRAQI ATTACK ON ISRAEL

HON. TONY P. HALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1991

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply outraged at the unprovoked Iraqi attack on Israel. I am relieved that no chemical weapons were used. Even so, the threat of chemical warfare still remains frighteningly real for the Israeli people. As we speak, the air raid sirens are sounding in Tel Aviv and Jerusalem.

I extend my most sincere sympathy and compassion for the victims of last night's attack, and for the entire State of Israel. The world community is united against Saddam Hussein, but it is Israel that could bear the brunt of the Iraqi wrath. Our troops need to protect Israel from another attack.

We need to fight this war hard and fast, and prevent Hussein from again attacking Israel. Israeli involvement could seriously disrupt the fragile alliance of Arab and Western forces.

To accomplish this goal, our troops need the full support of the United States. I will vote for today's resolution because it expresses unequivocal support for the men and women fighting to end this war.

During floor debate on the Persian Gulf crisis, I voted against the Solarz-Michel resolution and for the Gephardt-Hamilton resolution because I hoped for peace, not war. Now that the fighting has started, our troops deserve and need unwavering support from the U.S. Congress so they can do their job quickly and accurately, and come home as soon as possible.

Many of my constituents have children and grandchildren, husbands and wives in Israel

and in Saudi Arabia. I join with the Dayton community in hopeful prayer for their safety.

For the sake of all nations involved, let us all pray for a quick end to the fighting.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION RELATING TO MOVING EXPENSE DEDUCTION

HON. BRIAN J. DONNELLY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1991

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today relating to the income tax deduction for moving expenses. This minor change in the tax laws would raise in excess of \$1 billion over 5 years, and is fully justified on tax policy grounds. Last October, this amendment was adopted unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means and I hope that it will be approved again this year.

Mr. Speaker, the moving expense deduction was added to the Internal Revenue Code as part of the Revenue Act of 1964. Prior to that date, moving expenses were not deductible for Federal income tax purposes. The courts and the Internal Revenue Service had reached conflicting results on the tax treatment of reimbursement for moving costs paid by employers; in addition, Congress was concerned that taxpayers whose moving expenses were not reimbursed by their employers were placed at a disadvantage for tax purposes. Consequently, in 1964, Congress decided that moving expenses should be deductible in computing adjusted gross income.

For purposes of determining whether moving expenses are deductible, taxpayers must meet, among other requirements, a distance test. In 1964, this test was satisfied only if the taxpayer's new principal place of work was 20 miles or farther from the taxpayer's old residence than his old residence was from his old place of work. In subsequent tax legislation, Congress modified this distance test three times: in 1969, the threshold was raised to 50 miles; in 1976, it was lowered to 35 miles.

It is my view that in this day and age, 35 miles is an unreasonably low threshold. In 1969, Congress noted that raising the 20 mile threshold was justified because the lower threshold "allows a taxpayer a moving expense deduction even where the move is merely from one suburb of a locality to another." (H. Rept. No. 413, 91st Cong., 1st Sess., at 75). In my mind, there is little justification for Congress subsidizing local moves. In this highly mobile society, only taxpayers who must travel long distances should qualify for the deduction; my legislation accomplishes that goal.

Mr. Speaker, I attach a technical explanation of my legislation for the RECORD.

TECHNICAL EXPLANATION OF LEGISLATION PRESENT LAW

In computing taxable income, taxpayers may claim itemized deductions. Itemized deductions include a portion of medical expenses, home residence interest, certain theft and casualty losses, State and local income and real property taxes, and moving expenses.

Under present law, a taxpayer may generally deduct expenses related to moving if the move is related to commencing work at a new location. To be deductible, a taxpayer must satisfy a distance test, a length of employment test, and a commencement of work test. The distance test is only satisfied if the new principal place of work is 35 miles or farther from the taxpayer's old residence than his old residence was from his old place of work.

EXPLANATION OF PROPOSAL

Under the bill, the distance test would be increased from 35 miles to 200 miles.

EFFECTIVE DATE

The bill would be effective for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1991, unless the taxpayer commenced work at the new principal place of work before January 1, 1992.

A BILL PERMITTING EARLY RETIREMENT FOR MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH INSPECTORS

HON. NICK JOE RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1991

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a bill, which I introduced during the 101st Congress, to make applicable to mine safety and health inspectors certain provisions which are currently applicable to law enforcement officers.

Namely, my bill will permit an early-out retirement opportunity for mine safety and health (MSHA) inspectors, at age 50 with 20 years service, due to stresses related to their jobs. The bill is identical to last year's measure, except that it now contains a one-time exemption for current MSHA inspectors from the mandatory retirement provisions currently applicable to other law enforcement officers. In other words, the one-time exemption from the mandatory retirement ages will apply to MSHA inspectors employed in those positions upon enactment of the bill into law. The only other change to the bill, different from last year's, was to conform the bill to laws enacted last year affecting law enforcement officers, such as pay comparability provisions.

I would like to reiterate my reasons for this legislation. First let me assure you that my long association with coal mining and related mining activities, I am deeply aware of the many job-related stresses that prey upon MSHA inspectors.

My bill makes it imperative for each Member of Congress to take a look at the mine health and safety inspector's job, so that we can confront and acknowledge the physical dangers and hazardous conditions they face every day, year after year on the job. Among those hazards are: Exposure to explosive methane gas, unstable ground and roof, poisonous atmospheres, radiation and harmful dusts, and dangerous machinery. These are factors in the jobs of the men and women employed in more than 20,000 U.S. mining operations.

Job stresses in an MSHA inspectors job is both physical and mental, caused by such factors as: The performance of their jobs in underground settings, where it is dark, cold, and

wet. Their work is more often than not performed in crouched or kneeling positions in areas no more than 26 inches high, for more than 4 hours at a time. A mine inspector's physical condition requires him or her to show they are able to maintain their bodies in kneeling positions for up to 4 hours, while at the same time breathing noxious gases and harmful dusts, and while subject to roof cave-ins and methane gas explosions. While they are performing such feats of endurance, they are also carrying backpacks containing testing and sampling equipment weighing from 40 to 80 pounds.

Mine safety and health inspectors are individuals appointed as authorized representatives of the Federal Government, under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor. They are agents of the Government, sworn to enforce mine safety and health laws and, as such, they are law enforcement officers. In my view, the job-related stress of their jobs entitles them to an early retirement policy every bit as much as for agents of the Government employed by U.S. Customs, U.S. Marshals, or the DEA and FBI.

Mr. Speaker, when MSHA inspectors, who are aging on the job after 20 years of stress, become the least bit impaired either physically or mentally, it can mean the same sudden death for them and the miners they are attempting to protect, as the sudden death faced by other law enforcement officers with a gun pointed at their heads.

Just this past week, in my district in McDowell County, WV, there was a mine explosion that took the lives of two miners. I spent the better part of one afternoon and evening with the surviving members of these two families. Even in the best of times, mine accidents happen. You can imagine what it would be like if we did not have these dedicated, finely trained MSHA inspectors who keep down incidences of mine accidents that cause so much death and destruction. If you can't imagine it, you have only to study the history of coal and other mining operations to realize the carnage that was allowed when no standards for health and safety were in place, and few if anyone in charge of performing inspections of mines or enforcing such standards as were in place.

This is not to say that the McDowell County mining accident of this past week was the result of poorly performing mine inspectors who, if they were doing their jobs would have been avoided. The cause of the accident is still under investigation by MSHA inspectors. The point I am making is that the MSHA inspectors themselves fear for the day that one of them, because of age, because of poor health, because of job stress, will cause a fatal mining accident.

So Mr. Speaker, let this body pay attention, and let them think about the lives at stake—both miners and inspectors—and let them give serious and favorable consideration to this early retirement policy for MSHA inspectors.

I have talked with these men and women, and they tell me: Mr. RAHALL, passing the initial physical test for an MSHA inspectors job is very hard indeed for an 18-year-old; passing the physical test during subsequent job recertification tests for a man of 55 is impossible.

Mr. Speaker, MSHA inspectors work very hard, and take pride in their training and ability to reduce health and safety hazards by enforcing the mine safety and health standards that are in law. They save many lives each and every year through their diligence and attention to details on the job.

According to our most recent data, in 1988, there were 111,944 citations issued in the coal mine industry, 6,559 closure orders, 792 imminent danger orders, and 68 percent of the citations were determined to be significant and substantial. The same kind of statistics are found in metal and nonmetal mines, but not as many on an annual basis as in the coal mining industry. MSHA inspectors not only find and report, or cite, coal mine operators for these violations of mine safety and health law, they enforce them by closing mines. For doing their jobs, they face the ire of the coal mine operator who is losing business during such closures, which produces, over time, an additional job-related stress.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I reiterate that MSHA inspectors under my bill will be given the right to retire at age 50 with 20 years experience, due to the physical and mental stress related to their working conditions in the performance of their jobs.

They are in danger every day, and at the end of 20 years service, the cumulative effects of the job-related stress could impair them both physically and mentally to the point where more, rather than fewer, mine accidents could occur, killing inspectors as well as coal miners. They deserve, and the coal miners who depend upon them for their health and safety would be better served, if MSHA inspectors are given this entitlement to early-out retirement options.

If my colleagues desire to cosponsor this legislation, I urge them to call me at 225-3452.

THE POSITION OF THE CROATIAN PEOPLE ON THE PERSIAN GULF CRISIS

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1991

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, please insert the following letter from Dobroslov Paraga, president of the Croatian Party of Rights, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It outlines the position of the Croatian people on the Persian Gulf crisis.

CROATIAN PARTY OF RIGHTS,
Zagreb, Croatia, January 15, 1991.

MR. PRESIDENT,
Members of Congress.

DEAR HONORABLE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: While dramatic changes are still occurring daily in Eastern Europe and an unavoidable confrontation has developed in the Middle East I wish to personally thank you on behalf of the people of Croatia on your courageous assumption of world leadership to ensure that fundamental human rights and liberties are available to all.

As President Havel stated to me when I met with him in Prague on October 29, 1990—"if there are human rights violations going

on anywhere, then human rights are threatened everywhere."

Your support of the freedom seeking peoples of the world, from Lithuania to Kuwait and beyond, is instrumental in the achievement of this goal and nowhere do we understand this more than in Croatia.

While we Croats have not yet completed our transition to democracy and independence I can personally testify that had it not been for the U.S. Senate passing S. Res. 169 on August 4, 1989 supporting my efforts to bring about increased respect for human rights in Yugoslavia that I would now not be writing to you as the President of the Croatian Party of Rights from our offices in Zagreb but rather from one of the jail or prison cells where I had previously been incarcerated and tortured for circulating a petition asking for amnesty for all political prisoners in Yugoslavia in 1980.

Although we in Croatia now have democratic political parties we do not yet have "government of the people, by the people, for the people." While we are patiently changing this we will not allow ourselves to be identified by the actions of those who still rule us but do not represent us.

On September 28, 1990 Associated Press ran a report on Iraqi jets being serviced by Yugoslavia in Croatia which Senator Dole noted with a request for an investigation in the Congressional Record of October 24, 1990 entitled "What are Iraqi Military Aircraft Doing in Yugoslavia?" And then on January 11, 1991 Reuters reported that Iraqi agents or terrorists may already be in place in Europe having infiltrated through Yugoslavia.

We have all watched these terrifying experiences unfold into dramatic statements of man's inhumanity to man and we've all wondered why and when will it end. The people of Croatia know how difficult it is, if not impossible, to end armed aggression and oppression without help and we feel that it is our duty to express ourselves to the people of the United States and the world community by volunteering our services to actively participate with the following declaration:

"DECLARATION

"We, the people of Croatia, join in this opportunity to stand, and side, with our friends, the United States of America and other governments of the world, who in this time of world crises have courageously assumed the burden of leadership in full implementation of the United Nations Resolutions; and whereas the Federal Government of Yugoslavia, and its offspring Governments in the Republics of Yugoslavia, have chosen a position of non-commitment; we feel that this international effort to stop the brutal aggression of Saddam Hussein demands the active support of all who care about preserving freedom and the rights of human beings to live peacefully within their own country.

"We, the undersigned, in our desire to actively participate, shoulder to shoulder, with other nations of the world, hereby, volunteer our services to the multinational forces united in resolve to secure the justice which will alone result in lasting peace, as well as extending our commitment to a multinational peace keeping force to preserve this new world order."

Presently the people of Croatia are expressing themselves by individually signing this declaration just as over 500,000 Croats have signed a petition for independence from Yugoslavia over the course of the last six months. Maybe someday soon the nation of Croatia will once again be able to express itself as a country in such an honorable commitment as is this participation

in achieving the unalienable rights of all people—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

DOBROSLAV PARAGA,
President.

THE PROLIFERATION OF CREDIT CARDS

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1991

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, last month I received a well-written and thought-provoking December 21 letter from my constituent, David H. Piller, senior vice president of the Ohio Valley National Bank in Henderson, KY, which I would like to share with my colleagues.

Dave Piller has contacted me as a member of the House Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs about his serious concerns regarding the proliferation of credit cards and their financial burden to young families. As a financial counselor to young families, he is witnessing first hand the severe consequences to these individuals as they are burdened beyond help due to their inability to refrain from accepting the credit cards offered them with offerings of credit limits which bear no apparent relationship to the ability to repay.

I urge my colleagues to reflect upon the timely comments contained in Dave Piller's letter to me. His letter follows in its entirety:

OHIO VALLEY NATIONAL BANK,
Henderson, KY, December 21, 1990.

U.S. Representative CARROLL HUBBARD,
Rayburn House Office Building, Washington,
DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HUBBARD: Being aware of your position on the Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs Committee, I feel that you are the proper person to whom I should express a deep concern that I have regarding the proliferation of credit cards.

I donate a considerable amount of time gratis to the financial counseling of young families. In virtually all cases these families are burdened beyond help. It is not unusual for them to have three or more cards with total indebtedness of \$14,000 or more at interest rates of 20 percent or greater! These cards have been mass mailed with offerings of credit limits which bear no apparent relationship to the ability to repay.

Of course, the large banks providing these cards defend themselves by pleading that they incur large losses which must be covered by higher rates. The reality is that the industry is reaping the consequence of greed unrestrained by any sense of responsibility or regard for the well being of those unfortunate enough to be lured into such debt. If the interest rates on these cards were restricted to 3 points over prime, for example, the providers would make certain that this form of credit would be extended only to those who were worthy of the credit.

As it stands, where will it end? Larger and larger losses, leading to more and more imprudent lending, at higher and higher rates. What a disgrace! Who really loses? All of us—taxpayers, families broken by the strain of impossible debt, social help agencies, etc.

I would very much like to visit with you when you are in town to discuss this further.

DAVID H. PILLER,
Senior Vice President.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A BATTLE ON THE HOMEFRONT

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1991

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, the administration prefers to downplay the unavoidable fact that American men and women are fighting—and dying—in the Persian Gulf because we badly need the oil that is produced there. And we have become dependent on that oil because the Reagan administration failed to learn any lessons from the oil crises of the 1970's.

As an editorial in today's Boston Globe points out, the Bush administration—with its continuing opposition to the development of a much-needed comprehensive energy policy—seems to be following down the same wayward path. I commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues.

[From the Boston Globe, Jan. 18, 1991]

(A BATTLE OVER OIL WORTH FIGHTING FOR)

One does not have to think that the United States should be "fighting for oil" in the Mideast to agree that one lesson that is reinforced by the situation there is that the nation must reduce its dependency on foreign oil. It is a lesson that the Bush administration seems unwilling to learn.

The word in Washington is that a decision has been made in the White House to avoid any mention of energy policy in the president's State of the Union address, an obvious time to unveil any new thinking on the subject. The rationale for this decision, it is said, is that nothing the administration would be inclined to offer would make much of a dent in our oil dependence, and the administration doesn't want to call attention to that.

From the beginning, President Bush cavalierly rejected the idea that energy conservation should be any part of the initial response to the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait.

That posture put the president on the side of those forces in his administration, reportedly led by chief of staff John Sununu, who reject the development of a national energy policy on the grounds that the government role in such matters should be limited. It also contradicted the conviction of his own Energy Department that real savings in energy use are possible and wise.

The litany of what can be done has been recited for 15 years now: tougher fuel-efficiency standards for cars; a national model code for energy efficiency in housing; new standards of lighting in industrial and commercial buildings; tougher energy standards for appliances; federal incentives for states to encourage state regulators to promote utility conservation programs such as those already in place in Massachusetts.

A comprehensive national energy policy could reduce by 20 percent the United States' energy consumption in this decade. It may not be worth fighting a war to control foreign oil, but it is worth a political battle in Washington to reduce the nation's dependence on it.

January 18, 1991

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION RELATING TO TAX BENEFITS FOR SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS

HON. BRIAN J. DONNELLY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1991

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today which would recapture the enormously generous tax breaks which several corporations received at the end of 1988 after acquiring some savings and loan associations. In my view, Congress should have never authorized these tax breaks, and in light of the scandals arising from the S&L crisis, my legislation is an appropriate and necessary response.

Mr. Speaker, during the 1980's, Congress enacted several tax breaks for banks and savings and loan institutions. Some of these breaks clarified unsettled areas of the tax laws. In November 1988, Congress decided to cut back on these tax breaks by 50 percent, effective on January 1, 1989. In December 1988 alone, tax breaks worth \$4.6 billion were awarded to acquired savings and loan associations.

These tax benefits were enormously generous, and allowed acquirers of savings and loan institutions to take advantage of income tax benefits available to no other taxpayer. In fact, Tax Notes magazine described these benefits as the best tax shelter since the Tax Reform Act of 1986. The Committee on Ways and Means approved an amendment I offered in May 1989 to eliminate these tax breaks.

Those tax breaks were bad enough. What's worse is that many of the purchasers of the savings and loan institutions have no experience running a financial institution. They include cosmetic companies, automobile manufacturers, and investment bankers, many of whom purchased the savings and loans to take advantage of the tax breaks before they were cut back.

My legislation would, quite simply, recapture these tax benefits in certain abusive instances. In addition, the legislation clarifies an area of the income tax law relating to the tax treatment of the acquirer of a savings and loan after its disposition. In my opinion, Congress should act on this legislation as rapidly as possible, and I insert a technical description of this legislation at this point in the RECORD:

TECHNICAL DESCRIPTION OF LEGISLATION

PRESENT LAW

Consolidated return rules

If two or more corporations file a consolidated income tax return, losses of one affiliate can offset income of other members of the group. The Treasury Department has promulgated regulations to implement these consolidated return provisions of the Internal Revenue Code.

Under the consolidated return regulations, a parent corporation's basis in the common stock of its subsidiary is reduced by the amount of losses utilized by the parent. Consequently, the basis of the subsidiary's stock in the hands of the parent can become negative, creating an excess loss account. Under the regulations, the parent must "recapture" (i.e., recognize as income) the excess

loss account in the case of certain disposition events, including the sale or transfer of the subsidiary's stock (see, Treas. Regs. 1.1502-19(b)).

Earnings and profits calculations

In general, a corporation's earnings and profits account is a measure of the corporation's ability to pay dividends. If a corporation has no E&P, distributions by the corporation to its shareholders are generally considered a return of capital. A member of a consolidated group owning stock in a subsidiary is required to make a positive adjustment in the basis of the subsidiary's stock for the allocable part of the subsidiary's undistributed E&P for the year (see, Treas. Regs. 1.1502-32(b)(1)).

The Internal Revenue Service has taken the position that payments by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation to a corporation acquiring a savings and loan institution generate earnings and profits, even if those payments were tax-free to the acquirer under section 597 of the Code (see, e.g., PLR 8850052, holding 13). Earnings and profits so generated therefore cause a positive adjustment in the acquiring corporation's excess loss account or investment account (see, e.g., PLR 8912043, holding 12).

EXPLANATION OF PROPOSAL

Under the bill, certain events occurring with respect to specified acquired savings and loan associations would trigger a recapture of tax benefits from the parent organization.

After January 3, 1991, if such an association becomes subject to the jurisdiction of a court in a title 11 or similar case, or receives additional financial assistance from the Federal government, then the tax benefits available to that association are recaptured from the parent. The recapture amount would be equal to the reduction in tax on the parent by reason of the utilization of losses of the acquired institution incurred after January 3, 1991, reduced by required payments in respect of these tax reductions.

The bill applies to acquisitions of savings and loan associations which occurred after November 10, 1988 and before January 1, 1989 and with respect to which tax benefits repealed in 1989 were available.

In addition, the bill clarifies that amounts excluded from gross income under section 597 of the Internal Revenue Code (as in effect before its repeal by the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989) do not generate earnings and profits. Thus, these amounts would not increase the basis of a subsidiary's stock in the hands of the parent and a positive adjustment would not be made in the subsidiary's excess loss account or investment account on account of such amounts. Consequently, the bill overrules private letter rulings 8850052 and 8912043 and any other rulings which reach the same result.

EFFECTIVE DATE

The bill is effective for dispositions after January 3, 1991.

SUPPORT FOR NATIONAL KOREAN WAR MEMORIAL

HON. ROBERT G. TORRICELLI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1991

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues and my fellow Ameri-

cans to join me in support of a most worthwhile endeavor: The construction of a National Korean War Memorial here in our Nation's Capital. I would like to enter into the RECORD the following proclamation and urge support for this vital monument:

KOREAN WAR VETERANS ASSOCIATION

DEAR PATRIOT: We are now engaged in a fund drive to raise the money needed for the completion of a long overdue National Korean War Memorial in Washington, D.C. It will be built near the Lincoln Memorial and will honor those who served our country during the Korean War. That war where our nation and others of the United Nations did help rescue the Republic of South Korea from communist aggression. It required 38 months and many bitter battles to restore peace.

Many casualties, both military and civilian resulted from that action. As an act of gratitude and to commemorate victory South Korea erected many battle monuments. They have remembered that so many of our and their forces fought, suffered and died in that war. Let us now follow their example and contribute to build our own National Korean War Veterans Memorial.

We must show our concern for the following reasons: To properly record the deeds of our valiant forces into American history. Our proud history that has traditionally reflected the deeds of our patriots since the birth of our nation. That history that does neither glorify nor advocate war; but does show appreciation for those patriots who did fight our wars when called to do so. Our history that has always inspired our school children with "love of country" and instilled values into them that lasted for life. Those values have been and are still the essence of "Americanism".

The National Korean War Veterans Memorial will acknowledge the fact that over 54,000 American servicemen died and over 103,000 were wounded. Over 8,000 were missing in action and more than 7,000 were taken prisoner of war. The prisoner of war suffered extreme cruelty as attested to by the fact that about half of them perished. We must also remember that the parents and relatives of the brave fallen have also suffered greatly. We can now show them that we care and will prove it by our donations. Recently in Bergen County, New Jersey, a Korean War Veterans Memorial was dedicated. Many speeches were delivered and there was a large audience. We of the Korean War Veterans Association were also there with many members. Soon after the monument was unveiled we noticed an elderly woman walk to and place her hand upon the face of that monument. She briefly stared at it through tearing eyes. Then she quietly departed through the crowd. God bless that dear mother for she now knows that her son has been at last remembered by that county and soon shall be by a grateful nation, when the National Korean War Veterans Memorial is in place.

Let's join together and achieve a resounding victory in this the symbolic final campaign of the Korean War. You may consider your donation as an investment in "Americanism" and perhaps flag desecration will some day become unknown.

For further information contact the Korean War Veterans Association, Box 12205, Baltimore, MD 21281.

FORT TOTTEN NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE

HON. BYRON L. DORGAN

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1991

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation designating that the Fort Totten State Historic Site, on the shores of Devils Lake, be declared a national historic site.

Fort Totten is one of the best-preserved frontier military posts in the trans-Mississippi west. It stands as a monument to the long standing relationship between the U.S. Government and the American Indians. Fort Totten's history reflects the Federal responses to the Indian question.

In 1862 a combination of white harassment, broken treaties, and an absence of military troops due to the Civil War caused the Great Sioux uprising. Congress then abrogated all existing treaties and sent Gen. Harry Hastings Sibley to quash the rebellion. As a result of this action many Sioux bands migrated to the Devils Lake areas for security. The Sioux then proceeded to attack trade, supply, and travel routes. The War Department saw this as a major threat to the security of the white people in the Devils Lake Area and to the expanding agricultural frontier. In 1867, under the direction of Capt. Samuel A. Wainwright, the 31st Infantry built Fort Totten about 900 feet from the shore of Devils Lake.

In 1890, because of the relative calm of the region, the fort was closed and placed under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Government to be used as a mission school. Shortly after this it became national policy that the Federal Government take responsibility to furnish primary and secondary education for all Indian children of school age residing on the reservation. This policy was set at an annual meeting at the posh Catskills resort of the Smiley brothers called Lake Mohonk, and was called the Mohonk Conference. The conference called for a comprehensive plan for Indian education and their calls were answered by Thomas Jefferson Morgan, the new Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

Reservation day schools were designed to familiarize Indians with the white communities style of living, so they would eventually be absorbed by the larger white society. This process involved the teaching of English and other basic academic subjects as well as manual and industrial skills. Also as an effort to introduce the Indians to civilized society, they were taught the responsibilities of citizenship and evangelical Christianity. Students were expected to learn enough to become successful farmers and tradesmen, but some went beyond the Indian schools to white preparatory, collegiate and professional schools. Fort Totten was selected as a site for one such school, and its history is a part of the successes and failures in the attempt to assimilate the American Indian. Those who attended the school were taught not to resist the process but to survive.

Fort Totten continued as a combination day and boarding school during 1934 to 1935 after which its function was expanded to include a

preventorium for children with tuberculosis. Teachers as well as nurses and a doctor were staff members for the new institution. The preventorium was implemented by the National Government out of their concern for Indian health and to control the spread of tuberculosis. The day school then officially closed in 1937 in order to devote more time to health care. After the 5-year trial period for the preventorium was over in 1940, Fort Totten was reverted back to a day and boarding school.

On March 6, 1959, a concurrent resolution was passed by the North Dakota Senate to accept the Fort Totten site from the U.S. Department of the Interior. The North Dakota State Historical Society was then charged with its oversight and maintenance.

The Fort Totten State Historic Site consists of approximately 9.81 acres and is located within the boundaries of the Fort Totten Indian Reservation. The area owned by the State of North Dakota was originally the drill and parade area and is enclosed by a square of buildings. Except for one company barracks the square proper described above is exactly as it was when the post was closed in 1890.

The existing structures that comprise the Fort Totten Historic Site are of great historical value. The adjutant's office retains much of its original character and depicts 19th century army administration. The hospital is one of the few surviving examples of 19th century army hospitals.

The North Dakota State Historical Society since becoming trustee in 1960 has maintained the 16 remaining buildings while publicizing the site and its history. The society has restored much of the site and developed an interpretive center that includes exhibits and concessions. Although the site has been recognized for its State and regional history, it should not be overlooked for the contribution it has made in the history of the United States and its governmental policies in regard to the American Indian.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. The text of my bill is as follows:

H.R. —

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Fort Totten National Historic Site Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress hereby finds that—

(1) Fort Totten is one of the best preserved military posts surviving from the Indian wars in the trans-Mississippi west;

(2) Fort Totten has played a significant role in American Indian history, first as an Indian agency for Indians coming to the area and then, from 1890 through 1960, as an Indian industrial school; and

(3) Fort Totten is in immediate need of major repairs and restoration work which are beyond the financial capabilities of the State of North Dakota and which would be best undertaken by the National Park Service.

SEC. 3. ACQUISITION OF HISTORIC SITE.

In order to preserve Fort Totten, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire by donation from the State of North Dakota, the real property described in section 4 for the establishment and administration of a national historic site.

SEC. 4. DESCRIPTION OF SITE.

The real property referred to in section 3 is that real property known as the Fort Totten State Historic Site located approximately twelve miles southwest of the town of Devils Lake, North Dakota, on the south shore of Devils Lake on the Fort Totten Indian Reservation.

SEC. 5. ADMINISTRATION OF SITE.

The property acquired under this Act shall be known as the "Fort Totten National Historic Site", and it shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the National Park Service, in accordance with the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes"; approved August 25, 1916 (30 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1, 2-4) and the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the preservation of historic American sites, buildings, objects, and antiquities of national significance, and for other purposes", approved August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U.S.C. 461-467).

SEC. 6. GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN.

Within two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall develop and transmit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives a general management plan for the use and development of the site consistent with the purposes of this section, indicating—

(1) the lands and interests in lands adjacent or related to the site which are deemed necessary or desirable for the purposes of resource protection, scenic integrity, or management and administration of the area in furtherance of the purposes of this section and the estimated cost thereof;

(2) the number of visitors and types of public use within the site which can be accommodated in accordance with the protection of its resources; and

(3) the location and estimated cost of facilities deemed necessary to accommodate such visitors and uses.

SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

PENSION BENEFITS FOR CLERGY MEMBERS

HON. LEON E. PANETTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1991

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I am reintroducing legislation today which would address a problem faced by many retired clergy members, whose pensions are artificially limited by a technical provision of the Tax Code. My bill would enable them to receive the full pension to which they should be entitled based on their preretirement compensation.

The problem for many members of the clergy is that they receive a considerable portion of their usually modest compensation as a nontaxable payment for room and board, often known as a parsonage allowance. Section 107 of the Internal Revenue Code specifically gives this allowance tax-free status.

The law gives the Internal Revenue Service flexibility in determining what constitutes compensation for purposes of determining maximum pension payments. However, the IRS

has chosen not to include parsonage allowances in this definition. Thus, I believe Congress must act.

For many individuals, taxable compensation may be below \$10,000, while the combination of taxable compensation and parsonage allowance, which truly reflects their actual compensation, might be considerably greater than \$10,000. The intent of the law—to limit overly generous pension benefits—is grossly distorted when it does not even permit these retired clergy members to receive an amount equal to their actual preretirement compensation.

The result is that many retired clergy members who have put in decades of service are arbitrarily limited to a \$10,000 annual pension, when in fact they would be entitled under their pension plans to more—if they were permitted to include their parsonage allowance in determining their preretirement compensation. I do not think this is fair, and I do not think it makes sense.

My bill addresses this problem in a very simple way. It includes in preretirement compensation, for purposes of determining maximum pension benefits, the value of a clergy member's parsonage allowance.

Let me emphasize that this bill does not mandate any specific pension benefit for a clergy member. It simply allows a higher benefit to be paid for those who have worked long enough and been compensated enough to qualify for that higher benefit.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would correct what I believe is an unintended impact of the legislation we have passed in recent years to limit excessive tax-deferred pension plans. I hope my colleagues will support this measure.

Following is the text of my bill:

H.R. —

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

That (a) paragraph (3) of section 415(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (defining average compensation for high 3 years) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'compensation' includes amounts excluded from gross income under section 107."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to years beginning after December 31, 1988.

TRIBUTE IN MEMORY OF DR. DESIDIR GALSKY

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1991

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sadness that I learned recently of the tragic passing of Dr. Desidir Galsky in an automobile accident in Prague. Dr. Galsky was a tireless defender of the Czechoslovak Jewish community who worked diligently to assure the survival of Jewish culture in that nation. Many Americans will remember him for his role in the "Precious Legacy" of Judaic treasures exhibition which toured the United States. Dr. Galsky also was deeply involved in

the underground Czech translation, publication and dissemination of great Hebrew literature, in children's education and in the general promotion of the Czechoslovak Jewish community. In tribute to Dr. Galsky, I would like to share with you some reflections on his life which I recently received from Mr. Mark Talisman, president of the Project Judaica Foundation, who worked closely with Dr. Galsky:

He was harassed by the authorities when they knew that they could not control him. He was harassed and shunned by some of our own groups not wanting to come into disfavor with the Communist regime. But he survived with great mental fortitude and a deep belief in the goodness of the survival of the Czechoslovak Jewish community.

When asked continuously whether his community would survive, as tiny as it was, as beleaguered as it had become, he would answer with a question—and how long does the American Jewish community expect to survive? It then became clear that he intended for his community to survive at least as long. As a tribute to his vision, many young vibrant Jewish leaders have emerged. Leo Pavlat is currently the Press and Cultural Attache in the new Czechoslovak embassy in Israel and will return to resume his leadership position. Jirka Danicek has just been elected interim Executive Vice President of the Jewish Community to lead the community until full elections are held. Both are under 35 years old! Karl Sidon is currently concluding his rabbinical studies in Israel and will return to Prague as its young, vibrant spiritual leader.

Many more projects were conceived by Dr. Galsky since freedom came to Prague in November of 1989. A house with many rooms was just purchased with help from the Central British Jewish Fund for rest and recreation in the countryside. A van was also bought for trips outside the city. Books in Hebrew and English are being sought for the library and personal use. We sponsored David Franklin, a recent graduate of Yale, to teach English classes in the Jewish Town Hall for community members, museum staff, and those wishing to learn; five classes are underway daily.

Galsky was to lead a delegation of distinguished Czech and Slovak non-Jewish leaders to Israel in January. He was very excited about the people from the highest levels of life in his country who were calling him to be included. That program, sponsored by Kalman Sultanik, a dear friend, will be taken over by Jirka Danicek immediately.

Galsky hosted a very productive visit by JDC's very creative director of international programs, Aryeh Cooperstock. He took him to the Castle to visit with Mrs. Havel's deputy and talked of creating a special program for handicapped children. He also spoke with a distinguished professor of agriculture about establishing Israel-Czech joint projects. Both are already in planning. Aryeh was the last person from abroad to be with Dr. Galsky and is committed to have these programs serve as a living memorial to him in areas he cared about greatly.

Dr. Galsky's greatest wish was to see his community be able to generate jobs and income from projects which would be based upon renovations of buildings now being returned to the Jewish Community having been expropriated first by the Nazis and then the Communists. The Chevre Kaddisha Building will soon be returned and needs to be renovated slightly to provide offices for the number of new and revived groups which have sprung up since freedom has returned.

The Kafka Society, the Czechoslovak-Israel Friendship Society (2,500 members already), the new B'nai Brith, El Al, the Jewish Agency, and many more each needing a home. This is an ideal place.

There needs to be a high quality gift shop for the millions of visitors streaming through the Jewish community to visit the Jewish Museums and Alteneuschul. None of their tourist dollars benefit the very community whose objects the tourists visit.

There needs to be an organized tourist visitors center with maps, multilingual self-guided tour materials and a friendly reception on an organized basis. He wanted to have restoration of the age-old coffee house with readings of Jewish literature, poetry and music staffed by the community and profits returning to it.

He had a long, rich agenda. He was communicating and personally hosting leaders like Mitterand, Thatcher, Bush, the Dalai Lama, Genscher of Germany, a host of Israeli leaders, dozens of members of the U.S. Congress and Senate and thousands of our Jewish leaders. He distinguished himself during his articulations of his view of Jewish and general conditions in Europe during meetings of the European Jewish Congress in Paris and elsewhere. His trips to Israel since freedom made him a hero to the people of Israel.

When a very popular talk show host asked him during a recent live broadcast throughout Israel why he did not lead an aliyah to Israel of his Jewish community, he reminded the host that he had just told Galsky his fondest wish was to be able to pray in the Alteneuschul in Prague (built in 1279). So, Galsky asked, if we are all in Israel, the Alteneu will have been locked up and will have become yet another museum of the Jewish past and there would be programs for anyone in the Alteneu.

It is not better, Galsky mused, to come to Prague, visit with a small but vibrant Jewish Community with whom he could *daven* in the Alteneu? Is it not better to have this small but influential community in Prague to relate to the Czech government in regard to Israel's future? Everywhere Galsky went in Israel, people approached to congratulate him on his comments, with which there had been total and widespread agreement.

So it is friends, that we were lucky enough to have been able to know him and to work with him. His ending is tragic. The sadness it has brought to Raphi, Jessica, Jill and me is indescribable. But his life was not a comet dissipating into nothingness. His touch was long, loving and will persevere through each person with whom he came into contact. His was fundamentally the life of a caring Jew whose leadership caused the elevation in dignity of people who otherwise would have known nothingness from their long darkness. His sun shined broadly, illuminating everyone around him in his country and far beyond. We are grateful beyond measure for his valor, fortitude, intellect and grace.

The Project Judaica Foundation has established a special fund to honor Dr. Galsky and his work. I hope others will consider helping them in continuing the projects which meant so much to him.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO MODIFY THE ADVANCE DIRECTIVE PROVISIONS OF THE MEDICARE PROGRAM

HON. BRIAN J. DONNELLY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1991

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today to substantially modify the provisions of the Medicare Program relating to advance directives which were added as part of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990.

Mr. Speaker, advance directives such as living wills or durable power of attorney gained prominence last year after the Supreme Court's Cruzan decision. Partially in response to that decision, and partially to make the public aware of the existence of laws regarding advance directives, the Ways and Means Committee's Subcommittee on Health held hearings on these enormously important, emotional, and controversial issues, and legislation was introduced on the subject.

Because of strong concerns and reservations that I had over that legislation, I negotiated a compromise with its sponsor last summer. I had hoped that this compromise language would have been included in the reconciliation legislation; unfortunately, it was not.

Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I think the provisions ultimately adopted in the reconciliation legislation were adopted in haste, and I strongly oppose the legislation as it now stands. Most Members were unaware that the budget bill contained any language on this issue at all; those who were aware were receiving conflicting signals from lobbying organizations for hospitals on the provisions ultimately adopted.

The bill I am introducing today contains the compromise language which was worked out last summer on advance directives. The Committee on Ways and Means has approved similar legislation, and I urge its enactment this year.

Mr. Speaker, I insert a technical description of my legislation in the RECORD at this point:

TECHNICAL DESCRIPTION OF LEGISLATION PRESENT LAW

Provisions in the Medicare program define the basic obligations of hospitals, physicians, and other providers of health services as a condition of participation in the program. Under present law, certain requirements are imposed on providers relating to advance directives, such as living wills or durable powers of attorney.

Generally, providers are required: (1) to make information available to their patients on the patient's rights under State law with respect to advance directives and the written policy of the provider respecting the implementation of these rights; (2) to document in the patient's medical record the existence of an advance directive; (3) not to condition care based on the existence or non-existence of an advance directive; (4) to ensure compliance with State law governing advance directives; and, (5) to educate the staff and community on issues relating to advance directives.

The requirements generally apply to hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, home health

agencies, hospice programs, and health maintenance organizations. Similar requirements exist under the Medicaid program for these providers, as well as for nursing homes.

EXPLANATION OF PROPOSAL

Under the bill, several modifications would be made to the advance directive provisions of the Medicare and Medicaid programs. First, the requirements relating to advance directives would not apply to skilled nursing facilities or nursing homes, but would apply to physicians. Second, providers and physicians could be exempt from the requirement relating to making information available to patients based upon religious, ethical, or moral considerations. Such an exemption would have to be requested by a certified letter to the Secretary stating the grounds for exemption. Third, employees of providers, and physicians, would be prohibited from witnessing an advance directive executed by a Medicare or Medicaid beneficiary who was receiving care from the provider or physician.

In addition, the provisions of the Medicaid program imposing requirements on providers similar to those imposed under the Medicare program would be repealed. The Secretary would be directed to make information on advance directives available to the general public and to Medicare beneficiaries. The requirement that providers educate the staff and general community on issues relating to advance directives would be repealed. Finally, the Secretary would be required to work with States or an appropriate State agency to develop necessary documents.

EFFECTIVE DATE

The provisions of the legislation are generally effective as if included in sections 4206 and 4751 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990.

INTRODUCTION OF THE NATIONAL BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY CONSERVATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH ACT

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1991

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, biological diversity—the variety of life and its processes—is really the basis of our global richness. Biodiversity is the result of millennia of evolution, of trillions of interactions of plants, animals, and microorganisms.

The more one looks at nature and natural resources, one is drawn to the conclusion that life's diversity itself is our ultimate resource.

The Earth's biodiversity is being reduced today. The most conservative estimates are that 0.2 percent of all life's species are being extinguished each year. The rate may actually be closer to 2 percent—with tens of thousands of species being lost annually. This rapidly accelerating rate is already unprecedented in 65 million years. We are eliminating life's variety as if the world will end tomorrow. And in so doing, we are pushing the world in this direction.

Today, I am introducing the National Biological Diversity Conservation and Environmental Research Act. The principle behind the bill is that all life has value and that in order to protect it, we must understand life and direct our resources toward preventing additional losses.

The bill would: Bring together the resources of the science community with the conservation agencies; create a system whereby our knowledge of the biota is coalesced, enhanced, and rapidly made available to those involved in natural resource management; and eliminate the impediments of the current Federal piecemeal approach, and provide a system featuring coordination and strategic planning.

The bill states that it is our Nation's policy to conserve the diversity of life. It also establishes a National Center for Biodiversity Research to provide the information necessary to set conservation priorities. This information will be used through an interagency process to develop and implement a plan to conserve our Nation's biota. The essence of the plan will emphasize prevention as well as recovery.

The focus will be on protection and management of ecosystems as well as their parts. The idea being in order to save the trees—or the owls, or the squirrels—we must save the forest. And the way to start saving the forest is to start understanding it as a forest.

We need to manage our resources with respect to ecological laws and boundaries as well as according to political laws and boundaries. Only through this prevention approach that marries science and management will we be able to truly conserve life's diversity.

The fundamental nature of biodiversity conservation extends beyond saving individual endangered species or protecting individual ecosystems fragments. If we are to be effective in preserving our national resources we must adopt a comprehensive policy.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

SUPPORT FOR SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 2

HON. WAYNE T. GILCHREST

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1991

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, 1 week ago today, I stood before my colleagues in the House of Representatives in strong support of the resolution authorizing the President of the United States to use force as an absolute last resort in the Persian Gulf situation. I supported that resolution as a strong signal of unity from the Congress of the United States in the hope of achieving a peaceful settlement in the Persian Gulf.

Less than 72 hours ago, President Bush, however reluctantly, addressed the American people, regarding the United States, British, Kuwait, Saudi, French, and Italian air attacks on Iraqi command and control centers, air defense, airfields, and missile sites attempting to cripple Iraqi forces before dawn, because, he said, "only force can make him leave Kuwait."

Today, I voted in support of the U.S. presence in the Persian Gulf. That resolution passed with an overwhelming margin of 395 to 6. Again, the Congress is united in its decision to support the President of the United States, acting as Commander in Chief, with regard to his actions in the Persian Gulf situation thus far.

We must get Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait as quickly as possible without the sacrifice or bloodshed of the United States or our allied forces men and women.

I stand in support of all 45 Maryland Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Reserve units as well as the six Army National Guard units presently deployed in the gulf. I recognize the tremendous sacrifice they are making and applaud their courageous acts.

As a veteran, I realize first hand the effects war has on individuals and their families, and I pray for the expedient return of all 415,000 men and women of the U.S. Armed Forces and the 158,000 members of the Reserves and National Guard.

Our collective courage and commitment will ultimately bring about the blessings of peace and stability in this most troubled region of the world.

THE 73D ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1991

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in commemorating the 73d anniversary of Ukrainian independence.

On January 22, 1918, with Russian guns sounding from across the Dnieper, the Ukrainian Central Committee proclaimed an independent Ukrainian national republic dedicated to the principles of democracy, tolerance, and human rights. This declaration was the culmination of years of struggle by Ukrainians against czarist oppression. The new Ukrainian Government embraced freedom of speech, religion, assembly and the press, as well as numerous social reforms for all of its constituents.

Independence was short lived, however, as the Soviet regime eventually overran the young republic. The Soviets have kept the Ukraine in subjection for over six decades, trying at every turn to erase the culture and traditions of this region through stringent russification policies.

Months ago, as the Iron Curtain crushed to the ground, its links rusted and corroded by the inner contradictions of the system which supported it, free people everywhere expressed hope that Ukrainians would finally be able to realize the dream of that first independence day. Indeed, this hope was kindled by an all too brief period of greater openness for Ukrainians.

But this year, as in too many years before, there is little cause for celebration in the Ukraine. No banners will fly in Kiev on this independence day. No joyful speeches will be heard.

For even now, as the eyes of the world focus on the troubled Middle East, Soviet troops have once again tightened their grip on the Ukraine. Their mission is one of naked intimidation, launched in the desperate hope of extinguishing the nationalistic fire of self-determination which burns there.

Despite the pressure of an enormous armed presence, its press shackled, its legislature

bound and gagged, Ukrainians continue to work to regain the democratic nation which was so brutally wrenched from them.

Young Ukrainians are the driving force of the democratic movement in the Ukraine today. The spirit of the Ukrainian people has not been broken. They continue to struggle bravely for their rightful inheritance, knowing, as their parents did, that self-determination is the only end and democratic struggle the only means.

Mr. Speaker, I am moved by the example of these courageous individuals. Their commitment to the ideals of liberty, democracy, and basic rights is a shining example to us all and a stirring testament to the strength of the human spirit to endure the harshest oppression.

I am thankful for the opportunity to pay them tribute and to remind the world that to forget or forsake their noble cause is to dim the light of democracy everywhere.

CONDEMNS IRAQ'S ATTACK ON ISRAEL

HON. JIM RAMSTAD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1991

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to unequivocally deplore Iraq's attack on Israel. The attack against Israel was unprovoked, and it was against civilians. It was intolerable.

Saddam Hussein cares nothing about the lives of civilians, whether they are harmless neighbors or his own people.

With each day, it becomes more and more clear what kind of man Saddam Hussein is—a brutal, ruthless, imperial dictator. He has shown us that his naked aggression against Kuwait can easily be turned toward another innocent neighbor.

With each day, it becomes more and more clear why Saddam Hussein must be stopped and why the multinational force has coalesced against him. By confronting Saddam now, as a united force of nations, we are foregoing what might be a much more dangerous and unstoppable Saddam later.

By attacking Israel, Saddam Hussein is trying to draw Israel into the war and weaken the Arab coalition against him. He is trying to justify his invasion of Kuwait by erroneously linking it with the Palestinian cause. Yet from the beginning, there was no linkage.

Now, I believe, Israel has every right to retaliate. Most of her Arab neighbors, if not the world, agree.

While I hope that this situation will end quickly and with as few casualties as possible, I strongly support our objectives and believe that we should continue to use "whatever means necessary" to see the U.N. resolutions successfully carried out.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO REPEAL THE INCREASE IN MEDICARE PAYMENTS TO KIDNEY DIALYSIS CLINICS

HON. BRIAN J. DONNELLY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1991

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today to repeal the increase in Medicare payments to kidney dialysis clinics which was enacted as part of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990. I am introducing this legislation because that increase in payments was unnecessary, unneeded, and in a time of \$300 billion budget deficits, a waste of Medicare funds.

The budget agreement which Congress passed last October forced us to reduce the Federal budget deficit by one-half trillion dollars over a 5-year period. At a time when Congress was making the tough decisions to achieve these savings, it defied logic for Congress to provide an increase in payments to dialysis clinics which, quite simply, do not need the money.

Mr. Speaker, Medicare coverage of end stage renal disease patients has been described as a Government program born of compassion. Without question, the program has saved tens of thousands of lives; most dialysis patients would be unable to afford the tens of thousands of dollars necessary annually to treat their illness. But this compassionate program has turned into a tremendously profitable business for a handful of corporations.

A General Accounting Office audit showed that many dialysis clinics routinely post profits in excess of 20 percent. The GAO study showed as well that millions of Federal dollars have been paid to doctors and clinics for treatments that were never performed or were double-billed. The Nation's largest dialysis corporation used about \$21 million paid by Medicare to finance a stock deal that benefitted stockholders and company executives. The program has created an industry that "pits profits against patients," in the words of the Philadelphia Inquirer.

That being the case, it is unclear to me why Congress voted to increase payments to these clinics. Horror stories of mistreatment of patients, reused equipment, and outrageous examples of conflicts of interest abound. Instead of giving more money to dialysis clinics, Congress should have cut spending to them, while insuring that the decrease in spending reduced profits and did not come at the expense of quality of care.

I will have more to say about this issue later this year. For now, the easiest step that Congress could take would be to repeal the increase in last year's budget agreement, and take steps to reign in the burgeoning costs of this \$3.5 billion program. My bill takes an important first step by saving \$80 million over 5 years. I urge that it be acted on by the Committee on Ways and Means.

REGARDING EVENTS IN LITHUANIA

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1991

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, while our attention has been focused on events in the Persian Gulf, the people of Lithuania have been locked in a bloody battle for freedom and democracy against Soviet Armed Forces. It is becoming increasingly evident that Soviet officials are resorting to the use of force to suppress the democracy movement in Lithuania. I urge Premier Mikhail Gorbachev to resist the use of further force and allow self-determination for all Lithuanians.

The sight of Soviet tanks rolling through Vilnius, Lithuania earlier this week was reminiscent of Budapest during the Hungarian Revolution of 1956. Clearly, the progress the Soviet Union has made in human rights over the last few years stands in grave jeopardy.

For many years, I was active in efforts in the United States Congress to help bring democracy to Hungary. Recently, I had the honor of meeting with Mr. Gabor Demszky, the newly elected mayor of Budapest. Having fought against Communist oppression for many years, Mayor Demszky fully understands the challenges now facing the brave citizens of Lithuania.

The following are two letters of support to Lithuanian leaders. The first letter was sent by Mayor Demszky to Mayor Bernatoniš of Vilnius, Lithuania. The second letter is from officials to the Hungarian Freedom Fighters' Federation to Lithuanian Charge D'Affairs Stasys Lozoraitis.

BUDAPEST, HUNGARY,
January 15, 1991.

ESTEEMED MAYOR BERNATONIS: The tragic events of recent days created a sad and horrifying feeling among the citizens of Budapest. Please let the people of Vilnius know that we want to share the sorrow for the loss of their loved ones and we would like to offer our help for the relatives of the innocent victims. In the future, the citizens of Budapest will do everything in their power to help you in your effort to achieve peace guaranteed by international treaties.

We, Hungarians remember very well when in 1956 the leaders of Moscow—taking advantages of the crisis in Suez—created a puppet-regime attacked our country and wanted to crush our ambitions for freedom and independence by sheer force. The rulers of the Kremlin had to learn that the use of military force can delay results, but cannot stop us from fighting for our freedom.

There are those who detect a parallel between the events of 1956 and the event of 1991 in Vilnius. There may be common characteristics, but the differences are even more significant. The first is that since 1956 the world has experienced fundamental changes, and Moscow has to take into account the power that is the solidarity demonstrated by other nations for your cause. Secondly, the Soviet Union is not capable to fight against the rightful will of the people any longer. For this we are certain, that not arms, but reason will make the final decision in Vilnius.

Esteemed Mayor, in 1956 Budapest was titled the "Capital of Freedom." Today, we,

the citizens of Budapest, regard upon Vilnius as the capital of freedom. A place, where the idea of freedom cannot be taken away from the people anymore. A place, where the idea of freedom will be victorious.

Dr. GABOR DEMSZKY,
Mayor of Budapest.

HUNGARIAN FREEDOM
FIGHTERS' FEDERATION,
Rockville, MD, January 15, 1991.

Hon. STASYS LOZORAITIS,
Charge D'Affairs, Lithuanian Delegation,
Washington, DC

DEAR MR. LOZORAITIS, We, the undersigned representatives of Americans of Hungarian descent, express our strong solidarity with the Lithuanian people in their present struggle for Independence. We deplore the armed actions of the Soviet Union aimed at the destruction of freedom and democracy in the Baltic States.

The similarities between the circumstances in which the 1956 Hungarian Revolution was fought and the 1991 plight for Lithuanian Independence is waged reveal the fact that the fundamental mentality of Soviet dictatorship did not change during the past three and a half decades. Violation of human rights, international law and the rules of civilized behavior demand the unity of the world community in the condemnation of the heinous acts of the brutal, inhuman, unchanged Soviet system controlled and upheld by Mr. Mikhail Gorbachev.

Please convey our committed support of Lithuanian aspirations to your government and to your people.

With prayerful concern.

Eva Szorenyl, Co-President; John Dolinsky, Co-President, World Federation of Hungarian Freedom Fighters.

Jozsef Kovago, Former Mayor of Budapest.

Jullus Belso, Honorary Chairman, American Hungarian National Republican Committee.

Dr. Andras Pogany, President; Istvan B. Gereben, Co-President; Rev. Baan Vitez O.F.M. Past-President; Rev. Vazul Vegvari O.F.M. Past-President, Hungarian Freedom Fighters Federation U.S.A.

Ferenc Czane, President, Hungarian Freedom Fighters Federation, Los Angeles Chapter.

Robert Harkay, President, Szechenyi Association.

Hugo Martonfalvay, President, Hungarian Veterans Association.

Ferenc Mozel, Editor, Szivarvany.

Dr. Karoly Balogh, President, Hungarian Association of Massachusetts.

Louis Lote, President, Committee of Transylvania.

Dr. Gabor Szent-Ivany, Secretary, National Committee of Hungarians in Czechoslovakia in the U.S.A.

Dr. Edmund Gaspar, Vice President, Federation of Free Hungarian Jurists.

Beata Gereben, Vice President, Magyar Studies of America.

Dr. Andreas Csaplar, President, Collegial Society of Hungarian Engineers.

Tibor Helcz, President, Federation of Hungarian Former Political Prisoners.

Gabor Bodnar, Executive President, Hungarian Scouts Association.

Dr. Lajos Koncz, Executive Secretary, Harvard Circle.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE BALTIC INDEPENDENCE TRADE ACT

HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1991

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, as tanks roll through crowds of peaceful protesters in the streets of Lithuania's capital and Soviet paratroopers fire indiscriminately on unarmed civilians, we are again outraged by the brutal oppression of that troubled people. For all the progress that has been made in Eastern Europe, freedom has still not been secured in some countries whose people crave it.

Today, as a means of securing freedom and independence for Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia, I am introducing the Baltic Independence Trade Act. This legislation would withhold most-favored-nation trade status from the Soviet Union until independence is granted to the Baltic Republics. Seventeen other Members of Congress join me as original cosponsors of the bill.

On March 11, 1990, the people of Lithuania stepped forward to demand the return of the independence stolen from them by the Soviet Union 50 years ago. Following Lithuania's lead, the other illegally seized Baltic Republics of Estonia and Latvia declared their intent to break free of Soviet domination as well.

The three Baltic countries enjoyed free democratic governments from 1918 until 1940, when they were illegally invaded and annexed by the Soviet Union as part of a secret agreement between Stalin and Hitler. The United States and other Western nations have always refused to recognize Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania as parts of the Soviet Union.

From the first days of the independence movement last year, the Soviets have responded in a heavy-handed way to Lithuania's drive for freedom. They imposed a choking cutoff of vital supplies, and conducted frequent military maneuvers in the streets of Vilnius, the Lithuanian capital. With the Soviet military now moving to violently crush the movement for freedom and democracy in Lithuania, the United States can no longer forestall action. I believe this Nation needs to support the people of the Baltics by putting pressure on the Soviets where it can have a real impact—their economy.

The fact is that the United States actually signed most-favored-nation status agreements with each of the Baltic Republics in the 1920's. While these agreements were suspended in 1951 as a result of the Soviet occupation, they have not been officially revoked. Until the Soviet Union releases its hold on the Baltic States, it would be a terrible irony for the United States to grant MFN status to the Soviets.

The legislation I introduce today would send a clear message to the Soviet leadership. A message that, while the United States wants increased trade and peaceful cooperation with Moscow, it cannot be had at the expense of the Baltic peoples. Over the last 50 years, the United States Government has stood with the people of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia in their quest to restore freedom. We can stand with them now by putting pressure on the So-

January 18, 1991

viet Government to restore the independence of the Baltic States.

A TRIBUTE TO ALEX ACEY

HON. MICHAEL BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1991

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a good friend to me and to my congressional district, Mr. Alex Acey, whom I was grieved to hear passed away on January 17.

It is a plain and simple fact that the time granted to each of us is limited; it remains for each of us to make the best use of that time. I hope that it is a comfort now to Alex's wonderful wife, Dorothy, his two brothers and two sisters, that Alex Acey's name is written large in this regard.

Alex was a demanding man—no less of himself than of those he knew and with whom he worked. However, the world would not be so full of the wonders and benefits that we all enjoy were it not for its Alex Aceys. At 81, Alex was as full of enthusiasm and high regard for a job well done as anyone of any age—and there were many jobs well done by his hands.

I won't take the time to list them all. Suffice it to say he was dedicated to his community just as he was to his family. Before moving to my district in Florida, he was a self-employed tailor for 40 years in Detroit. He reached out into his community—both in Michigan and Florida—through his active service in the Masons of both States.

He was a 33d degree member of the Scottish Rite Masons and Royal Order of Scotland, where he served as potentate of the Shrine in Detroit. He was a charter member of the York Rite Sovereign College in Detroit and the York Rite Bodies of Michigan.

In Florida, he was a member and past president of the West Pasco County Historical Society and was cochairman of the West Pasco Centennial Celebration, as well as being active in the county Republican Party.

He spoke on my behalf on many occasions when I was forced to remain in Washington by my congressional duties. I knew him well, as did my family, and I loved and respected him.

All of us will miss him, and his passing will be a great loss for the Ninth Congressional District. However, all of us are the better for having known him and he will always be an inspiration for me.

INTRODUCTION OF JOINT RESOLUTION TO DISAPPROVE THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COUNCIL ACT, ASSAULT WEAPON MANUFACTURING STRICT LIABILITY ACT OF 1990

HON. THOMAS J. BLILEY, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1991

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a joint resolution which disapproves the

District of Columbia Council Act, the Assault Weapon Manufacturing Strict Liability Act of 1990. I ask my colleagues to disapprove this Council Act, not only because it is violative of the Home Rule Act, which restricts the council to enact laws which are exclusively applicable to the District of Columbia, but because it is bad law with far-reaching constitutional implications.

Specifically, this act seeks to hold gun manufacturers, importers, and dealers strictly liable for damages, regardless of fault or proof of defect, resulting from the use of certain handguns, rifles, and machineguns.

The act itself is an unconstitutional intrusion into interstate commerce which is beyond the authority granted by home rule, or to any other local government, and to any State government. The District cannot possess greater legislative powers than those reserved to the States. If the States cannot individually rewrite the Constitution, then surely the District cannot. It is our obligation to exercise the ultimate legislative authority over the District and we cannot turn a blind eye to this action without serious constitutional repercussions. The effect of the legislation has a scope extending far beyond any exclusive application within the boundaries of the city.

If there is to be a major overhaul of the tort laws of this country, with their widespread economic impact, then Congress itself must take up that task. Congress cannot delegate that responsibility to the District government. That, however, will be the precise effect if Congress fails to disapprove this council act.

This act is not about a victim receiving just compensation from the direct actions of another nor is it about receiving just compensation for negligence by a manufacturer. The District's own Corporation Counsel questioned whether the courts of the District of Columbia could exercise jurisdiction over nonresident manufacturers, importers, and dealers.

The legal theory upon which the act is based has already been litigated here in the District. The U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia and the Federal Court of Appeals have found that the "traditional tort theories—negligence and strict liability provide no basis for holding the gun manufacturer liable." But as certain as I am that this act would ultimately be struck down after very costly litigation, I do not believe we should leave this matter to courts. Congress has a constitutional responsibility which it should not abdicate.

Let me make this clear. This act, no matter how well-intended, is not about stopping the violence on the streets of Washington. The District Council banned these very same weapons 15 years ago. This act is an attempt to force manufacturers and dealers to pay for the consequences of criminal acts. The act applies to all designated weapons and would allow damages to be recovered from a manufacturer, dealer, or importer, regardless of whether they had any contact whatsoever with the victim or perpetrator. It would make no difference if the gun were stolen, purchased from a party many times removed from the original and lawful buyer, or acquired in a State where the purchase, sale, and ownership are sanctioned by law. It is clearly intended to drive legal businesses, large and small, into bankruptcy. This is not about recovering money

from the deep pockets of a huge corporation. The local gun and bait tackle shop businessman is at the same risk of having a weapon he once legally sold end up on the streets of Washington one day as is Colt, Beretta, and Israeli military industries.

Some Members may hesitate to intervene in this matter because of home rule. This act clearly violates home rule. The purpose of District self-government is to "relieve Congress of the burden of legislating upon essentially local District matters." This is not a local matter. There are no handgun manufacturers in the District to be regulated. You cannot legally purchase one of these weapons in the District. Congress intended to prohibit the District from enacting precisely such over-reaching laws when it granted home rule.

The test of whether to adopt this resolution of disapproval, the only test of significance in this particular matter, is whether Congress would have passed this same measure for the Nation. I do not know whether Council Act 8-289 would become a public law for the entire United States if Congress exercised the legislative process, but there is no reason for us to implicitly approve and adopt that act now.

There is no question that the District's level of violence is devastating. But violating the commerce clause of the Constitution, threatening legal, private enterprises, and violating the Home Rule Act are not the solution to controlling the violence.

While I hope that the District Council will take it upon itself to reconsider whether this course of action is appropriate and whether it will achieve its objectives, I must also note that time is short before this act may take effect. Aside from immediate Council action, this resolution of disapproval is the shortest, easiest, and most appropriate manner in which Congress can exercise its obligations.

A MESSAGE TO MR. GORBACHEV

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1991

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to send a clear and simple message to Mikhail Gorbachev: If you hope to maintain even a shred of the friendship you have cultivated with Western nations in the past several years, you will cease your policy of bloodshed and repression in the Baltics immediately. Wednesday, I cochaired a Congressional Human Rights Caucus hearing on the Baltic situation and yesterday I participated in a special hearing held by the Congressional Helsinki Commission on the grave situation in Lithuania. At these hearings I heard testimony that made it clear that the assault on Lithuania was a premeditated effort by the Soviet leadership to crush the peaceful call for freedom by the Lithuanian people and to send a powerful and sinister message to other republics that might be considering calling for their own active freedom.

No civilized nation can stand by and watch the tiny and peaceful Baltic States overrun by Soviet paratroopers. Until Mr. Gorbachev provides convincing evidence that the repression

of the Baltics will end, we should cease all preference and aid to the U.S.S.R. and seriously reconsider our relationship.

A TRIBUTE TO LEOLA GAINES MCCOY

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1991

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to honor a woman who has proven one individual can make a difference.

Leola Gaines McCoy of Peekskill, NY, has devoted her life to helping others. As a black woman born and raised in the segregated South, she made up her mind to be a force for good.

Ms. McCoy has made her mark as a supervisor/coordinator with the Association of Black Social Workers [ABSW] in which she has helped minority families adopt minority children. Ms. McCoy also has worked at the Peekskill Mental Health Clinic and reported and written for such newspapers as the Putnam County Courier, Patent Trader, the Amsterdam News and the Village Voice.

But perhaps Ms. McCoy's greatest achievement was her successful efforts to desegregate housing in the Syracuse, NY, area. As one who experienced segregation firsthand, it is not surprising Ms. McCoy would do all she could to fight it. Thanks to her, thousands of people in the Syracuse area are experiencing racial harmony.

Ms. McCoy's efforts have not stopped there. Her list of accomplishments is endless: Director of the Peekskill Westchester Black Professionals; cofounder of the Family Resource Center of Peekskill, which assists homeless families and was selected as the 1990 Westchester County project of the year; member of the NAACP-Peekskill chapter advisory board for more than 10 years; former board member of the Voluntary Service Society. For these and many other achievements she has been bestowed with many awards, such as her designation as the NAACP-Peekskill Woman of the Year.

On Saturday, January 26, a dinner by ABSW will be held to honor Ms. McCoy on the occasion of her retirement. While she may be stepping down, she is not stepping out. I am sure we will be able to count on Ms. McCoy to be on the front lines fighting for the people for many years to come.

TRIBUTE TO FRANK BACON

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1991

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a distinguished individual, Mr. Frank Bacon. Mr. Bacon is being recognized for 20 years of service to the St. Clair County Probate and Juvenile Court.

Throughout his professional career he has always been a dedicated public servant. Frank

served from 1948 through 1970 in the U.S. Air Force. Eventually he rose to the grade of chief master sergeant, becoming the superintendent of a mobile operations division in the Combat Mobile Communications Group.

Upon retiring from the Air Force, as a chief master sergeant, Frank worked briefly for the Capac Area School District as a mini manpower coordinator. In this position he placed deprived youngsters in a work/school program.

His compassion and desire to pursue this type of work led Frank to employment at the St. Clair County Juvenile Detention Center, and eventually at the St. Clair County Probate and Juvenile Court. In these capacities, he has worked hard to establish programs designed to help the youth of St. Clair County.

I am confident Frank will continue his sincere interest in the well-being of St. Clair County's youth. Through his involvement with various boards in our community, and by personally helping the youth of our area, Frank will always pursue the goal of making this a better community for all of us.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to recognize Frank on the floor of the House for his dedicated service to the youth of St. Clair County. We are all the fortunate beneficiaries of Frank's good work through the years. I am proud to be associated with him.

DO NOT FORGET LITHUANIA

HON. CHESTER G. ATKINS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1991

Mr. ATKINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn the recent attempts by the Soviet army to crush the freely elected democratic Government of Lithuania. While it is understandable why the world's attention would become focused on recent events in the Persian Gulf, it is important that we continue to pay the utmost attention to events in the Baltic republics. There is indeed a valid comparison between this crisis and the 1956 Soviet invasion of Hungary, which took place while the world's attention was focused on the crisis in the Suez Canal.

As little as a decade ago, many academicians scoffed when some experts suggested that the Soviet Union, an empire of over 100 distinct nationalities, would fall apart from within due to its ethnic diversity. Then the world watched in amazement at the tumultuous event which shook the Soviet Union in fulfillment of this prediction. We saw the Soviet Union's captive nations, longing for freedom, seize the opening offered by Soviet President Gorbachev's policies of glasnost and perestroika in their bid for freedom.

With the events of the last 2 weeks in Lithuania, the first of these proud nations to assert their independence, and the other Baltic republics, it is sadly becoming all too clear that the Soviet leadership intends to resist the persistent forces of history with brutality. On January 13, the Red army killed 15 peaceful protesters while taking control of the Vilnius broadcast facilities. Although the Lithuanian parliament has been fortified by a 12-foot high concrete wall and a 15-foot ditch, the Red

army's tanks around the building awaiting attack orders from Moscow. We now even hear stories of Soviet-sponsored violence in Latvia and President Gorbachev's attempt to crack down on the newly acquired freedom of the press in the Soviet Union.

All of us desires to see President Gorbachev succeed in his efforts to reform the Soviet system. However, I agree with those who have wisely said that we must not confuse the cause with the man. There are many risks which can arise from further instability within the Soviet Government—most importantly the concern over an unstable superpower's possession of nuclear weapons and the loss of the little control the Soviet Government has overgrowing anti-Semitism in that country. But even in the face of this concern over stability and reform within the Soviet system, we must not turn a blind eye to the injustices by the Soviet Government in the Baltic republics. I support President Bush's condemnation of the Red army's actions in Lithuania, but I also feel that the administration ought to seriously consider further pressure against the Soviet Government. The administration ought to follow the lead of the European Community by warning that, if the Soviet Government continues to use military force and coercion against Lithuania and the other Baltic States, we will end all assistance and technical cooperation with the Soviet Union. We must not let the Soviet Government think that we will ignore their actions in the Baltic republics in exchange for their support of our policies in the Persian Gulf.

HONORING THE PALISADES HIGH SCHOOL ACADEMIC DECATHLON TEAM

HON. MEL LEVINE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1991

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Palisades High School Academic Decathlon Team on their victory in the Los Angeles Unified School District championship. The team demonstrated beyond a doubt that they are among the best and brightest students in the city.

The nine-member team is coached by teachers Rose Gilbert and Donald Walz and is captained by David Elashoff. The team members are: Neal Kaplan, David Elashoff, Ritu Batra, Amir Berjis, Robert Brombach, Matthew Gelbart, Eddy Kup, Thatbiti Sabahive, and Lesley Young.

After months of hard work studying space exploration, team members were prepared to answer questions on the subject in a wide range of categories, including: Math, history, science, economics, speech and fine arts. Their work paid off when they were able to score 44,981 out of possible 60,000 points to win the city title. The Palisades team will travel to U.C. Riverside in March to compete for the State championships.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Pacific Palisades Academic Decathlon Team, and in wishing them the best of luck in their next competition.

IT IS NEVER TOO LATE TO NEGOTIATE FOR PEACE

HON. MAJOR R. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1991

Mr. OWENS of New York. Mr. Speaker, the men and women of our Armed Forces who are involved in Operation Desert Storm have my heartfelt prayers and support. A sizable number of them come from the 12th Congressional District and I know many of them personally and their families and loved ones. I unequivocally support our troops in the field by continuing to work intensely for peace.

Were this resolution simply an expression of moral support for these brave men and women I would not hesitate to vote "Yes." Unfortunately, this resolution goes beyond that and implicitly endorses the President's initiation of war against Iraq. I cannot and do not, as the resolution states, "commend and support" President Bush for pitching this Nation into war. Instead, I will vote "Present" and renew my appeal to the President to abandon force and pursue peaceful ends through peaceful means in the Middle East.

Nothing has changed in the past 2 days which convinces me that a non-violent resolution of the crisis still cannot and may not be achieved. Indeed, the push for peace is more important now than ever.

That Saddam Hussein is a bloodthirsty madman is no reason for the rest of us to abandon reason in our response to his mayhem. We can boldly, bravely, and resolutely face down this vicious barbarian without being goaded into further violence. We can pursue the liberation of Kuwait without forging another link in the horrible chain of violence that has for so long oppressed all peoples of the Middle East.

The world's only superpower can afford to be magnanimous. America does not have to worry about the loss of face. We can afford at this moment in the conflict to pause, to stop the violence, and give the Iraqi Government an opportunity to ponder and reconsider its intransigent position. Hussein may be a madman, beyond the reach of reason, but he is surrounded by military and civilian leaders who may be more rational and inclined to pursue negotiation rather than plunge deeper still into what threatens to be a calamitous bloodbath.

Our cause in the gulf is just and Americans can be proud of our efforts over the last several months to win back self-determination for the people of Kuwait. But war is still not the way.

It is not too late for a peaceful solution. It is never too late to struggle for peace. Break the chain of violence today; pursue peaceful ends through peaceful means now. Remember and reaffirm the wise words of Dr. Martin Luther King that every man and woman is a child of God, made in His image, and that "human life is too sacred to be taken on the battlefields of the world." In just a few days, politicians around the Nation will be remembering Dr. King in words and speeches. Today, in the sands of the desert, let us act to remember him with our deeds. Stop the war, struggle for

peace. Even if just one human life is saved, negotiating peace is worth the effort.

TRIBUTE TO MR. SIDNEY J. FRIGAND

HON. BILL GREEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1991

Mr. GREEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Sidney J. Frigand, who recently retired from his position as assistant executive director of government, community and public affairs for the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey.

Throughout Mr. Frigand's career in the public sector of New York and New Jersey, among other positions, he served as press secretary to the mayor of New York—1974–78, public affairs director of Metropolitan Transportation Authority of the State of New York—1970–74, and deputy executive director of the New York City Planning Commission—1965–67.

After attending Brooklyn College, Mr. Frigand never strayed far from the academic world. He was a visiting instructor at Pratt Institute School of Architecture and Planning, and a visiting lecturer at several colleges and universities including Manhattanville College, New York University's School of Public Administration, and at the Baruch School of City University Brooklyn College. He also has written articles and reports for the Museum of Modern Art, the New York Times, Ford Foundation, and numerous other institutional and professional publications.

In addition, Sidney Frigand is a member of several professional and civic organizations such as the New York Press Club, Citizens Budget Commission, and the Lower Manhattan Cultural Council. Likewise, he has received several awards such as the Page One Citation from the New York Newspaper Guild.

At this time, I should like to join my colleagues in commending my constituent, Mr. Sidney J. Frigand, a gentleman who dedicated his career to public service. Finally, I should like to wish Sidney all the best for a long and healthy retirement.

TRIBUTE TO DAN EHART

HON. CURT WELDON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1991

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Dan Ehart, former editor of the Suburban & Wayne Times, a weekly newspaper in my district, in Delaware County, PA. In December, Dan Ehart wrote his last editorial after 45 years on the job.

Dan Ehart is a man unafraid to speak his mind. All too often, our newspapers today print tepid, lukewarm editorials. They prefer summary and explanation to outspoken advocacy. Rare is the newspaper that will use unambiguous editorial commentary to challenge its readers to grapple with the central issues of the day.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Suburban & Wayne Times under Dan Ehart was one such paper. Whether writing on local, State, or Federal issues, Dan Ehart pulled no punches. When his readers disagreed with his point of view, his letters section was always open. Give and take was a staple of Dan Ehart's editorial page. In any given week, a reader could find a stinging editorial about the Persian Gulf, a strong letter to the editor regarding the civil rights bill, and commentary pieces on Pennsylvania State auto insurance or the county charter. No issue was too large, or too small, to be cogently discussed.

The editorial page of the Suburban was fun reading, with bold viewpoints expressed with vivid prose. I did not always agree with Dan Ehart, nor he with me, but I was always pleased to express my views on his editorial page. When he disagreed with me, he let me know, often in an accompanying editorial. But when he agreed with me, he expressed his sentiments just as strongly. Dan Ehart was nothing if not fair.

But I will admit that I am biased. I have been pleased to know Dan Ehart since I began my career in public service in 1977. During that time, I am proud to say that he and I have become friends. I trust that our friendship will endure.

I will miss reading Dan's editorials each week. But his retirement is more than just a personal loss. It is in truth a loss to the entire journalistic community in the Delaware Valley. One of the last oldtime newspapermen has sadly, put down his pen.

NATIONAL SENIOR CITIZENS HALL OF FAME, INC.

HON. HELEN DELICH BENTLEY

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1991

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the National Senior Citizens Hall of Fame, Inc.

Established on September 10, 1990, this organization is dedicated to honoring seniors for humanitarian community service, par-excellence. The Legacy award is given to individual seniors not on a competitive basis, but for unselfish dedication and community service and the quality of life their touch bestows.

Those recognized with the Legacy for their contribution to society will have their names immortalized forever in the archives of the National Senior Citizen's Hall of Fame [NSCHF]. The Legacy sculpture depicts the hand of a baby in the palm of an aged hand, signifying the understanding and love between generations, and service to others regardless of race, creed, or color. Legacy places importance upon the value of a memory rather than just leaving monetary or material possessions to future generations.

The National Senior Citizens Hall of Fame, Inc. stresses the wisdom of aging and is incorporated as a nonprofit organization for the purpose of recognizing the value of our older generation and their contribution to society. The work of this organization is particularly important as we are indeed an aging society.

However, the aging of our society is not a thing to be feared. I certainly hope that we recognize the wisdom, experience and knowledge which seniors possess. Such qualities are a priceless resource not to be wasted. I feel confident with such groups as the NSCHF, our country will be ensured the benefits of perhaps one of our most valuable resources, our senior citizens. It is for this reason that I commend the National Senior Citizens Hall of Fame and thank them for their hard work and dedication.

Although the youth of today may be the leaders of tomorrow, I believe that seniors are equally responsible for shaping tomorrow as their wisdom should be shaping and guiding the youth of today.

THE WORDS OF A SOLDIER ON THE SANDS OF SAUDI ARABIA

HON. BARBARA BOXER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1991

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, the debate about war is as old as humanity itself. Here follows the words of a soldier on the sands of Saudi Arabia, sent to me by Barbara Seith of Los Gatos, CA:

Speaking of things I've never seen
Sometimes I catch myself in a lie
Thinking of things that are only dreams
Makes me feel the need to cry

To never be given the opportunity
And never be told why for
To see the unseen or fulfill the dream
Is it really worth a war?

I hope the man who runs the show
Knows everything he needs to know
About people and families and other things
About the troops in the sand still full of dreams

This man, he carries a lot of weight
He controls many to many lives
He owns stock in a lot of soldiers
Their husbands, children, and wives

He has to answer to no one
He is the man on top of it all
He doesn't have to explain why or what he does

Just says it's the nation's call
This man is the owner of our destiny
We're all just peas in the pod
They gave him the title of President
But for now he's posing as God

TO HONOR "THE MIGHTY EIGHTH" ON THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE 8TH AIR FORCE HISTORICAL SOCIETY

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 18, 1991

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the contributions of the 8th American Air Force and its members who were dedicated to the freedom of our Nation.

In 1992 the 8th Air Force Historical Society will celebrate its 50th anniversary as a nonprofit veterans' organization. This society was

established to perpetuate and preserve the proud history of the 8th Air Force or as they came to be known, the Mighty Eighth. The 8th Air Force has served in every American armed conflict and remains, without a doubt, the most powerful air striking force in the world.

During the Second World War, more than 350,000 Americans served in the Mighty

Eighth. Its members received 17 medals of honor and countless awards for their distinguished service. Presently, 50,000 individuals are assigned to the 8th Air Force.

Each year the Historical Society sponsors a reunion to provide the opportunity for members to meet and memorialize those Air Force

men and women who died in service for our country.

In recognition of the Historical Society's preservation of history and the service of those men and women of the Mighty Eighth, please join me in honoring all members of the 8th Air Force.

During the Second World War, more than 350,000 Americans served in the Mighty Eighth. Its members received 17 medals of honor and countless awards for their distinguished service. Presently, 50,000 individuals are assigned to the 8th Air Force.

Each year the Historical Society sponsors a reunion to provide the opportunity for members to meet and memorialize those Air Force

men and women who died in service for our country. In recognition of the Historical Society's preservation of history and the service of those men and women of the Mighty Eighth, please join me in honoring all members of the 8th Air Force.

During the Second World War, more than 350,000 Americans served in the Mighty Eighth. Its members received 17 medals of honor and countless awards for their distinguished service. Presently, 50,000 individuals are assigned to the 8th Air Force.

Each year the Historical Society sponsors a reunion to provide the opportunity for members to meet and memorialize those Air Force

men and women who died in service for our country. In recognition of the Historical Society's preservation of history and the service of those men and women of the Mighty Eighth, please join me in honoring all members of the 8th Air Force.

During the Second World War, more than 350,000 Americans served in the Mighty Eighth. Its members received 17 medals of honor and countless awards for their distinguished service. Presently, 50,000 individuals are assigned to the 8th Air Force.

Each year the Historical Society sponsors a reunion to provide the opportunity for members to meet and memorialize those Air Force

men and women who died in service for our country. In recognition of the Historical Society's preservation of history and the service of those men and women of the Mighty Eighth, please join me in honoring all members of the 8th Air Force.

During the Second World War, more than 350,000 Americans served in the Mighty Eighth. Its members received 17 medals of honor and countless awards for their distinguished service. Presently, 50,000 individuals are assigned to the 8th Air Force.

Each year the Historical Society sponsors a reunion to provide the opportunity for members to meet and memorialize those Air Force

men and women who died in service for our country. In recognition of the Historical Society's preservation of history and the service of those men and women of the Mighty Eighth, please join me in honoring all members of the 8th Air Force.

During the Second World War, more than 350,000 Americans served in the Mighty Eighth. Its members received 17 medals of honor and countless awards for their distinguished service. Presently, 50,000 individuals are assigned to the 8th Air Force.

Each year the Historical Society sponsors a reunion to provide the opportunity for members to meet and memorialize those Air Force

men and women who died in service for our country. In recognition of the Historical Society's preservation of history and the service of those men and women of the Mighty Eighth, please join me in honoring all members of the 8th Air Force.

During the Second World War, more than 350,000 Americans served in the Mighty Eighth. Its members received 17 medals of honor and countless awards for their distinguished service. Presently, 50,000 individuals are assigned to the 8th Air Force.

Each year the Historical Society sponsors a reunion to provide the opportunity for members to meet and memorialize those Air Force